JOHN BULL.

"FOR GOD, THE SOVEREIGN, AND THE PEOPLE!"

Registered at the General Post Office as a Newspaper.

VOL. LXV. No. 3,386. SATURDAY, OCTOBER 10, 1885. WITH A SUPPLEMENT. PRICE 6D. By Post 6½D.

ALBEMARLE STREET, *October*, 1885.

MR. MURRAY'S LIST OF FORTHCOMING WORKS.

DICTIONARY OF CHRISTIAN BIOGRAPHY, LITERATURE, SECTS, AND DOCTRINES, DURING THE FIRST EIGHT CENTURIES. Edited by WM. SMITH, D.C.L., and HENRY WACE, D.D. Vol. IV., completing the work. Medium 8vo.

THE STUDENT'S HISTORY OF MODERN EUROPE; FROM THE FALL OF CONSTANTINOPLE TO THE TREATY OF BERLIN, 1878. By R. LODGE, M.A., Fellow and Tutor of Brasenose College, Oxford. Post 8vo.

*** Forming a New Volume of MURRAY'S STUDENTS' MANUALS.

TIRYNS: A PREHISTORIC PALACE OF THE KINGS OF ARGOS. Disclosed by Excavations in 1884-85. By HENRY SCHLIEMANN, D.C.L., &c. With Preface and Contributions by Prof. ADLER and Dr. DÖRPFELD. With Lithographs, Woodcuts, &c., from Drawings made on the spot. Crown 4to.

LECTURES ON ECCLESIASTICAL HISTORY, including the ORIGIN AND PROGRESS OF THE ENGLISH REFORMATION FROM WICLIFFE TO THE GREAT REBELLION. Delivered in the University of Dublin by the late Bishop FITZGERALD. Edited by WM. FITZGERALD, A.M., and Dr. QUARRY. With Memoir. 2 Vols. 8vo.

THROUGH THE BRITISH EMPIRE: SOUTH AFRICA, AUSTRALIA, NEW ZEALAND, THE STRAITS SETTLEMENTS, INDIA, THE SOUTH SEA ISLANDS, CALIFORNIA, OREGON, CANADA, &c. By BARON HÜBNER, Membre Associé de l'Institut de France. 2 Vols. Crown 8vo.

POPULAR GOVERNMENT: FOUR ESSAYS. I.—PROSPECTS OF POPULAR GOVERNMENT. II.—NATURE OF DEMOCRACY. III.—AGE OF PROGRESS. IV.—CONSTITUTION OF THE UNITED STATES. By Sir HENRY MAINE, K.C.S.I., Author of "Ancient Law," &c. 8vo.

THE VEGETABLE GARDEN; OR THE EDIBLE VEGETABLES, SALADS, AND HERBS CULTIVATED IN EUROPE AND AMERICA. By MM. VILMORIN and ANDRIEUX. An English Edition published under the direction of W. ROBINSON, Editor of "The Garden." With numerous Illustrations. 8vo.

A POPULAR EDITION OF THE AUTOBIOGRAPHY OF JAMES NASMYTH, Engineer and Inventor of the Steam Hammer. Edited by SAMUEL SMILES, LL.D. With Portrait and Woodcuts. Small 8vo. (Uniform with "Self Help.")

SYMBOLS AND EMBLEMS OF CHRISTIAN ART. By Miss L. TWINING. With 92 Illustrations from Paintings, Miniatures, Sculptures, &c. Crown 8vo.

THE MOON: CONSIDERED AS A PLANET, A WORLD, AND A SATELLITE. By James NASMYTH, C.E., and JAMES CARPENTER, F.R.A.S. With 26 Plates and numerous Woodcuts. *New Edition.* Medium 8vo.

THE ENDOWMENTS AND ESTABLISHMENT OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND. By J. S. BREWER, M.A., Preacher at the Rolls. *Second Edition.* Revised and Edited by LEWIS T. DIBDIN, M.A., Barrister-at-Law. Post 8vo.

A GLOSSARY OF PECULIAR ANGLO-INDIAN COLLOQUIAL WORDS AND PHRASES; ETYMOLOGICAL, HISTORICAL, AND GEOGRAPHICAL. By Col. YULE, C.B., and ARTHUR BURNELL, Ph.D. Medium 8vo.

LIFE OF GENERAL SIR CHARLES NAPIER, G.C.B. By the Hon. WM. NAPIER BRUCE. With Portrait and Maps. Crown 8vo.

SKETCHES OF THE HISTORY OF CHRISTIAN ART. By the late LORD LINDSAY (Earl of Crawford and Balcarres). New Edition. 2 Vols. Crown 8vo.

THE LIBERAL MOVEMENT IN ENGLISH LITERATURE. A SERIES OF ESSAYS. By W. J. COURTHOPE, M.A., Editor of "Pope's Works." Post 8vo.

LIFE OF WILLIAM CAREY, D.D., Shoemaker and Missionary, Professor of Sanscrit, Bengalee, and Marathee at the College of Fort William, Calcutta. By GEORGE SMITH, LL.D., Author of the Lives of John Wilson and Alexander Duff. Portrait and Illustrations. 8vo.

LIFE AND WORKS OF ALEXANDER POPE. Edited with copious Notes and Introductions, by W. J. COURTHOPE, M.A. Vols IX. and X. (PROSE WORKS), completing the works. (Vol. V., containing the LIFE AND A GENERAL INDEX, is in preparation.) 8vo.

PRINCIPLES OF GREEK ETYMOLOGY. By Prof. G. CURTIUS. Translated and Edited by A. S. WILKINS, M.A., and E. B. ENGLAND, M.A. Revised Edition. 2 Vols. 8vo.

THE STUDENT'S COMMENTARY ON THE NEW TESTAMENT. Abridged from "The Speaker's Commentary." Vol. II.—THE EPISTLES AND REVELATION. Edited by J. M. FULLER, M.A., Professor of Ecclesiastical History, King's College, London. Crown 8vo.

THE ETON LATIN GRAMMAR. PART I.—ELEMENTARY. For use in the Lower Forms. Compiled with the sanction of the Headmaster, by A. C. AINGER, M.A., and H. G. WINTLE, M.A., Assistant Masters at Eton. Crown 8vo. 3s. 6d. [*Ready.*

A FIRST LATIN EXERCISE BOOK. Adapted to the Eton Latin Grammar. By A. C. AINGER and H. G. WINTLE. Crown 8vo. 2s. 6d. [*Ready.*

FRENCH PRINCIPIA. PART III.—COMPOSITION. Containing a Systematic Course of Exercises on the Syntax, with the principal Rules of Syntax. 12mo.

JOHN MURRAY, Albemarle-street.

PUBLISHED BY PARKER & CO.

SERMONS.

THE ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY.

SINGLEHEART. Four Advent Sermons. By the Right Hon. and Most Rev. EDWARD WHITE BENSON. Second Edition, crown 8vo, cloth, 2s. 6d.

THE LATE BISHOP WILBERFORCE.

SERMONS PREACHED on VARIOUS OCCASIONS. With a Preface by the Lord Bishop of ELY. 8vo, cloth, 7s. 6d.

SERMONS PREACHED before the UNIVERSITY of OXFORD—1847—1862. 8vo, cloth, 10s. 6d.

SERMONS PREACHED before the UNIVERSITY of OXFORD—1863 to 1870. 8vo, cloth, 7s. 6d.

THE BISHOP OF NEWCASTLE.

THE AWAKING SOUL, as Sketched in the 130th Psalm. Addresses delivered in Lent, 1877. By E. R. WILBERFORCE, M.A. (the Right Rev. the Lord Bishop of Newcastle). Crown 8vo, cloth, 2s. 6d.

THE BISHOP OF SALISBURY.

THE ONE RELIGION: Truth, Holiness, and Peace desired by the Nations, and revealed by Jesus Christ. EIGHT LECTURES delivered before the University of Oxford, in the Year 1881. By JOHN WORDSWORTH, M.A., Bishop of Salisbury. 392 pp., 8vo, cloth, 10s. 6d.

UNIVERSITY SERMONS on GOSPEL SUBJECTS. Fcap. 8vo, 2s. 6d.

THE LATE BISHOP OF SALISBURY.

SERMONS on the BEATITUDES, with others mostly preached before the University of Oxford; with a Preface. By GEORGE MOBERLY, D.C.L., Bishop of Salisbury. Third Edition. 8vo, 7s. 6d.

BISHOP OF BARBADOES.

SERMONS PREACHED on SPECIAL OCCASIONS. By John Mitchinson, late Bishop of Barbadoes. Crown 8vo, cloth, 5s.

THE LATE DEAN STANLEY.

SERMONS and ESSAYS on the APOSTOLIC AGE. By the late Very Rev. ARTHUR PENRHYN STANLEY, D.D. Third Edition, Revised. Crown 8vo, cloth, 7s. 6d.

REV. CANON HOLE.

HINTS to PREACHERS, with Sermons and Addresses. By S. Reynolds Hole, Canon of Lincoln. Second Edition. Post 8vo, cloth, 6s.

FRANCIS PAGET, M.A.

CONCERNING SPIRITUAL GIFTS. Three Addresses to Candidates for Holy Orders in the Diocese of Ely. Together with a Sermon. By FRANCIS PAGET, M.A., Senior Student of Christ Church, Oxford; Examining Chaplain to the Lord Bishop of Ely. Fcap. 8vo, cloth, 2s. 6d.

THE REDEMPTION of WORK. Addresses Spoken in St. Paul's Cathedral. By FRANCIS PAGET, M.A., Senior Student of Christ Church, Oxford. 52pp., fcap. 8vo, 2s.

THE LATE REV. JOHN KEBLE.

SERMONS on VARIOUS OCCASIONS, By the late Rev. J. Keble, M.A. 8vo cloth, 12s.

THE LATE REV. EDWARD MONRO.

SERMONS CHIEFLY on the RESPONSIBILITIES of the MINISTERIAL OFFICE. By the late Rev. EDWARD MONRO, Incumbent of Harrow Weald. 8vo, cloth, 7s.

ILLUSTRATIONS of FAITH. Eight Plain Sermons:—Abel; Enoch; Noah; Abraham; Isaac, Jacob, and Joseph; Moses; the Walls of Jericho; Conclusions. Fcap. 8vo, cloth, 2s. 6d.

PLAIN SERMONS on the BOOK of COMMON PRAYER. Fcap. 8vo, cloth, 5s.

HISTORICAL and PRACTICAL SERMONS on the SUFFERINGS and RESUR-RECTION of our LORD. Two Vols., fcap. 8vo, cloth, 10s.

SERMONS on NEW TESTAMENT CHARACTERS. Fcap. 8vo, 4s.

ALLEGORICAL SERMONS.

TWENTY SHORT ALLEGORICAL SERMONS. By B. W. K. Pearse, M.A., and W. A. GRAY, M.A. Sixth Edition. Fcap. 8vo, sewed, 1s.

PARKER and CO., Oxford; and 6, Southampton-street, Strand, London.

MESSRS.

WILLIAM BLACKWOOD & SONS' LIST.

This day is published,

THE RIVER COLUMN. A Narrative of the Advance of the River Column of the Nile Expeditionary Force, and its Return down the Rapids. By Major-General HENRY BRACKENBURY, C.B., late commanding the River Column, Author of "A Narrative of the Ashanti War." With Maps by Major the Hon. F. L. L. Colborne, Royal Irish Rifles, late of the Survey Department of the Column. Crown 8vo, 7s. 6d.

This day is published,

THE FOUNDERS of the AMERICAN REPUBLIC. A History and Biography of Washington, Adams, Jefferson, Franklin, and Madison. With a Supplementary Chapter on the Inherent Causes of the Ultimate Failure of American Democracy. By CHARLES MACKAY, LL.D., Author of "Life and Liberty in America," &c. Post 8vo, 10s. 6d.

New Edition, Revised,

CHARACTERISTICS of ENGLISH POETS, from CHAUCER to SHIRLEY. By WILLIAM MINTO, M.A., Professor of Logic and English Literature in the University of Aberdeen, Author of a "Manual of English Prose Literature." New Edition, crown 8vo, 7s. 6d.

New and Cheaper Edition.

THE ROYAL MAIL: its Curiosities and Romance. By JAMES WILSON HYDE, Superintendent in the General Post-Office, Edinburgh. New Edition. Enlarged. With numerous Illustrations. Crown 8vo, 6s.

"The whole of the volume is so full of fascination that, once taken up, it is difficult to lay it down."—Times.

"An extremely readable and meritorious book."—St. James's Gazette.

"This volume is a storehouse of amusing anecdotes."

NEW NOVELS AT ALL LIBRARIES.

OAKS and BIRCHES. A Novel. By NASEBY. Three Vols., crown 8vo, 25s. 6d.

THE WATERS of HERCULES. By E. D. GERARD, Author of "Reata," "Beggar my Neighbour," &c. Three Vols., post 8vo, 25s. 6d.

"'The Waters of Hercules' is not an everyday novel. It is replete with strong and firm character-drawing, it abounds with fancy and with thought, and it possesses a quiet, absorbing, powerful interest for the reader from the commencement to the end of its pages."—Morning Advertiser.

"The style of narrative is delightful, easy, full of droll remark and humorous observation. . . . Pleasanter novels than these by E. D. Gerard are not to be found, nor any more fresh and bright and wholesome."—Daily News.

THEREBY. A Novel. By Fayr Madoc. Two Vols., post 8vo, 17s.

WILLIAM BLACKWOOD and SONS, Edinburgh and London.

HODDER and STOUGHTON

HAVE JUST PUBLISHED:

A COMMENTARY on the FIRST EPISTLE to the CORINTHIANS. By T. C. EDWARDS, M.A., of Lincoln College, Oxford, Principal of the University College of Wales, Aberystwith. Second Edition, 8vo, 14s.

"The work of a sound scholar, of a learned, earnest, and philosophical theologian, of a mind masculine and accomplished, it will speedily take its place as the indispensable aid to the understanding of this part of Scripture."—Expositor.

The Sixteenth Edition (Forty-fifth Thousand) of

NATURAL LAW in the SPIRITUAL WORLD. By Professor HENRY DRUMMOND, F.R.S.E., F.G.S. Crown 8vo, 7s. 6d.

A RABBINICAL COMMENTARY on GENESIS. Translated from the Judæo-Polish by PAUL ISAAC HERSHON, Author of "Treasures of the Talmud," &c. With Introductory Preface by the Ven. Archdeacon FARRAR, D.D. Crown 8vo, 7s. 6d.

ELIZABETH PRENTISS, the Author of "Stepping Heavenward;" her Life and Letters. By the Rev. G. L. PRENTISS, D.D. Third Edition, with Portrait and Illustrations, 7s. 6d.

"It is good to be brought into contact with such a lovely soul, and to trace the path she trod."—Academy.

THE ORIGIN of the WORLD, according to REVELATION and SCIENCE. By Sir J. W. DAWSON, LL.D., F.R.S., Author of "The Story of the Earth and Man," &c. Fourth Edition, crown 8vo, 7s. 6d.

THE PARABLES of OUR LORD, as Recorded by St. LUKE. By MARCUS DODS, D.D., Author of "The Parables as Recorded by St. Matthew." Crown 8vo, 3s. 6d.

THE RULE of FAITH and the DOC-TRINE of INSPIRATION. The Carey Lectures for 1884. By ROBERT WATTS, D.D., Professor of Systematic Theology in the Assembly's College, Belfast. Crown 8vo, 6s.

A New and Cheaper Edition of

THE DIVINE ORIGIN of CHRISTIAN-ITY INDICATED BY ITS HISTORICAL EFFECTS. By RICHARD S. STORRS, D.D., LL.D., of Brooklyn. Crown 8vo, 6s.

"The facts are arranged in luminous order, and set forth with fervour and eloquence. The union of close cogent reasoning and eloquent speech is remarkable."—Spectator.

THE CITY of GOD. A Series of Dis-cussions in Religion. By Rev. A. M. FAIRBAIRN, D.D., Author of "Studies in the Life of Christ," &c. Second Edition, 8vo, 7s. 6d.

London: HODDER and STOUGHTON, 27, Paternoster-row.

WANTED.

SPECIAL PREPAID ADVERTISEMENTS.

Advertisements of Clerical, Educational, and Domestic Wants and Vacancies will be received for insertion in this Column at the uniform charge of 2s. for 40 words, and 6d. for every additional ten words. Prepayment must in all cases be made, in stamps under 5s., above that by P.O.O. payable at Fleet Street Money Order Office.

SERMONS COPIED in MS. for the Clergy by Advertiser, who has access to ALL published Sermons, viz., Blunt, Vaughan, Melville, Keble, &c. (and all the leading preachers), price 1s. 6d. each. Address M.A., 24, Sistova Road, Balham.

CURACY WANTED. Oxford M.A. Priest. Sound Church principles. Winton preferred. Address Rev. L. Lewis, Milton, Pewsey, Wilts.

EXCHANGE—LIVING in London diocese. Income chiefly from tithe, £520 net, large rectory house and garden, beautifully situated. Address Rector, Oxford and Cambridge Club, Pall-mall, S.W.

COUNTRY CURACY (Kent) now VACANT. Mod. High. £150. Lodgings in village two miles from Faversham, ten from Canterbury. Pop. 600. Address M.A., Rev. H. E. Curtis, Faversham.

CURACY, for Clergyman with private means. Sound Church. Favourite sea-side resort, near large towns.—M.A., 50, Watergate st., Chester.

CURATE WANTED, at once. Young, married preferred. Views moderate. Salary £120. Apply Vicar, Lyddington, Uppingham.

CURATE WANTED, immed. Moderate. Single. Beautiful scenery. Cheddar Valley. Pop. 591. Station and telegr. Board and lodging in vicarage and £1 per wk., or other arrangement. Apply Rev. B. Brewitt, Westbury, Wells, Somerset.

CURATE (Senior) WANTED. Graduate. Under thirty-five. Good reader, preacher, and visitor. Desirable position; large church; surpliced choir, &c. Three Curates. Stipend £150, or if able and experienced in Mission work £175.—M. K., Mrs. Mayfield, stationer, Hagley-rd., Edgbaston, Birmingham.

WANTED, for quasi-sole charge of a scattered parish in Hants, a CURATE. Single. High Church. Address the Rev. H. Ll. Browne, Monk Sherborne, Basingstoke.

LOCUM TENENS WANTED, from November 21st, for two months. Rem.—vicarage, cook and manservant, with horse and trap and garden. Pop. 200. Beautiful church. Dry, bracing climate. Address Vicar, Fawley, Wantage, Berks.

TITLE given for Advent. Oxford or Cambridge Graduate necessary. Earnest worker. Mod. views. Large town parish. Address *D. A.*, 17, The Willows, Breck-road, Everton.

CURACY, or Sole Charge, WANTED. Thirty; married. High Ch. Active. Extemp. South pref.—M.A. Ox., Rectory, Berwick, Sussex.

CURACY WANTED, in the Chester diocese.—Curate, Lockyer's Private Hotel, Llandudno.

WANTED, by Priest, CURACY, or Quasi-Sole Charge. Agr. House. Views moderate. Good refs. and tests. Death of Vicar cause of leaving. Address Curate-in-Charge, Billerby, Leyburn, Yorks.

SOLE CHARGE, or small Living, WANTED; or New District. Married. Oxford Grad. Means. Thorough Church. Address S. C. L., Cameron, ss. agent, Ullapool, Ross-shire, N.B.

SANDHURST and PRELIMINARY.—Mr. Cooke, whose sympathethic method has hitherto carried even dull lads through, undertakes to reduce the late heavy majority. Apply 88, Gower-street.

DEAF and DUMB CHILDREN TAUGHT to SPEAK with VOICE by a Lady (Certificated G.S.T.). Sound education in a happy country home.—Miss E. A. Van, Hawham, Bristol.

WANTED, a NURSE LADY HELP Good needlewoman. Youngest child four. Apply to Mrs. Willis, Goodmanham Rectory, Mkt. Weighton

WANTED, immediately, in a large family, a good PARLOUR-MAID and a well-trained Lad as PAGE, about sixteen years of age. Address with full particulars, Mrs. Ingledew, Whitchurch, Cardiff.

GOVERNESS.—An experienced Lady, strongly recommended, requires ENGAGEMENT. Thorough English, French, German, good music, singing, drawing, painting.—G., Cambridge House Institution, Sheffield.

GOVERNESS (certificated) seeks RE-ENGAGEMENT. Thorough English, French, and German (acquired abroad). Latin, superior music and drawing. Age twenty-five. Excellent references.—Miss Bowen, Hartleigh House, Leamington.

A LADY highly recommends her English GOVERNESS. French (Paris), music, elem. Latin, drawing.—Mrs. Rogers, Swaningt on, Norwich

WANTED, superior NURSERY GOVERNESS. Three children, five, seven, and nine years. Oxford and Cambridge Local preferred. Latin. State salary.—Mrs. M., 20, Spencer-hill, Wimbledon.

CAN any Lady recommend thoroughly trustworthy HEAD-NURSE? Wages £20. Good plain needlewoman.—Mrs. Webb, 125, Pembroke-road, Clifton, Bristol.

WANTED, good GARDENER and GROOM. Also to milk and make himself generally useful. Lad kept. Good house and garden. State wages.—Rev. H. Cobb, Maulden Rectory, Ampthill.

HOLLOWAY'S PILLS.—With the darkening days and changing temperatures the digestion becomes impaired the liver disordered, and the mind despondent unless the cause of the irregularity be expelled from the blood and body by an alterative like these Pills. They go directly to the source of the evil, thrust out all impurities from the circulation, reduce disordered organs to their natural state, and correct all defective and contaminated secretions. Such easy means of instituting health, strength, and cheerfulness should be in the possession of all whose stomachs are weak, whose minds are mixed, whose blood, or whose brains are overworked. Holloway's Pills [illegible] a household remedy, whose usefulness, [illegible] to invalids as well as to the healthy, claims a universal [illegible]

ARMY SCRIPTURE READERS' AND SOLDIERS' FRIEND SOCIETY,

4, TRAFALGAR SQUARE, CHARING CROSS.

PATRON—His Grace the ARCHBISHOP of CANTERBURY.

PRESIDENT—GENERAL SIR A. J. LAWRENCE, K.C.B.

SPECIAL APPEAL.

The Friends of the Soldier are earnestly appealed to for FUNDS for the continued support of the Society. Ninety Scripture Readers are now actively employed in the Army at home and abroad.

With such unquestionable testimony on all sides to the beneficial influence of the Reader in camp, in barrack, and in hospital, we cannot come to any other conclusion than that the Lord's blessing is resting in no small degree upon this Institution; and with this conviction deeply impressed on our hearts, we lay this matter before all who can feel for a soldier's trials, a soldier's temptations, a soldier's devotion to his Queen and country, but, above all, for a soldier's everlasting welfare, confident—nay, more than confident, assured—that He will cause unknown supporters to spring up upon the right hand and upon the left, and stimulate old friends to fresh exertions. Two additional readers have sailed for Egypt and South Africa.

CONTRIBUTIONS will be THANKFULLY RECEIVED by the Treasurer, V. G. M. Holt, Esq., 17, Whitehall-place; at the Bankers, National Provincial Bank of England, 212, Piccadilly; by the Secretary, Mr. William A. Blake; or by the Hon. Secretary, Colonel J. W. F. Sandwith.

BARNARD'S

PATENT FOLDING HAMMOCK BASSINETTE AND BASKET.

These are the only Bassinettes awarded the Grand Medals, Diplomas of Honour, Prizes, and Honourable Mentions over all others at the Great Exhibition in Paris, 1878; Philadelphia, 1876; Vienna, 1873, in Two Groups; Alexandra Palace in 1875; Manchester, 1880, for their Practical Utility, Comfort, Convenience, Safety, Beauty, and Portability.

Price, prettily trimmed in Chintz, from £2 2s.; ditto, ditto, with Muslin and Lace, from £2 12s. 6d. Baskets to match from 18s. 9d. As a protection against unprincipled imitators, intending Purchasers should send for Illustrated Price List of the sole Inventor, Patentee and Manufacturer—

BRADLY BARNARD, 107, ST. PAUL'S ROAD, HIGHBURY, LONDON, N.

SEASONABLE DELICACY.—WITH STEWED FRUIT.

BROWN & POLSON'S CORN FLOUR

As BLANCMANGE, CUSTARD, BAKED or PUDDING.

NOTE.—Unlike many other Corn Flours, this bears the names of its Manufacturers, who offer the guarantee of their long-established reputation for its uniformly superior quality.

LONDON THEATRES, &c.

DRURY LANE THEATRE. — This Evening, at 7.45, HUMAN NATURE.

LYCEUM THEATRE.—This Evening, at 8.0, OLIVIA.

THEATRE ROYAL, HAYMARKET.—This Evening, at 8, DARK DAYS.

ADELPHI THEATRE.—This Evening, at 8, ARRAH-NA-POGUE.

PRINCESS'S THEATRE.—This Evening, at 8, HOODMAN BLIND.

STRAND THEATRE. — This Evening at 7.30, THE MARRIED RAKE. At 8.15, NICHOLAS NICKLEBY. At 9.15, COUSIN JOHNNY.

BRAND and CO.'S OWN SAUCE.

SOUPS, PRESERVED PROVISIONS.

POTTED MEATS and YORK and GAME PIES; also

ESSENCE of BEEF, BEEF TEA,

TURTLE SOUP, and JELLY, and other

SPECIALITIES for INVALIDS.

CAUTION: BEWARE OF IMITATIONS.

SOLE ADDRESS

11, LITTLE STANHOPE STREET MAYFAIR, W.

J. Whippell and Comp'y.

MANUFACTURERS OF

CHURCH FURNITURE AND CLERICAL OUTFITTERS.

EXETER: High Street and Cathedral Yard.
LONDON: 44, Charing Cross.

BLAIR'S GOUT PILLS.

THE GREAT REMEDY FOR GOUT and RHEUMATISM.

The excruciating pain is quickly relieved and cured in a few days by this celebrated Medicine.

These Pills require no restraint of diet during their use, and are certain to prevent the disease attacking any vital part.

Sold by all Chemists at 1s. 1½d. and 2s. 9d. per box.

ROBINSON AND CLEAVER, BELFAST,

Manufacturers by Special Appointments to H.M. the Queen and H.I. and R.H. the Crown Princess of Germany.

IRISH LINEN "Their Irish Linen Collars, Cuffs, Shirts, &c., have the merits of excellence and cheapness."—Court Circular.

COLLARS, Ladies' and Children's three-fold, 3s. 6d. per doz.; Gents' four-fold, 4s. 11d. to 5s. 11d. per doz.

CUFFS, For Ladies, Gentlemen and Children, 5s. 11d to 10s. 9d. per doz.

Best Quality Longcloth Bodies, with four-fold all linen fronts and cuffs, 35s. 6d. the half dozen (to measure, 2s. extra). New designs in our Special Indiana Gauze and Printed Shirtings and Unshrinkable Flannels for the season. **AND SHIRTS.**

IRISH LINENS, Real Irish Linen Sheeting, fully bleached, yards wide, 1s. 11d. per yard; 2¼ yards wide, 2s. 4½d. per yard (the most durable article made, and far superior to any Foreign manufactured goods). Roller Towelling, 18in. wide, 3½d. per yard.

Surplice Linen, 8½d. per yard. Linen Dusters, 3s. 3d.; Glass Cloths, 4s. 6d. per doz. Fine Linens & Linen Diaper, 10d. per yard.

Fish Napkins, 2s. 11d. per doz. Dinner Napkins, 5s. 6d per doz. Table Cloths, 2 yds. square, 2s. 11d.; 2½ yds. by 3 yds., 5s. 11d. each. Kitchen Table Cloths, 11½d. each. Strong Huckaback Towels, 4s. 6d. per doz. Monograms, Crests, Coats of Arms, Initials, &c., woven and embroidered. **AND DAMASKS.**

CAMBRIC Children's, Hemmed for use 1s. 5d. per doz.
Ladies', do. do. 2s. 6d. „
Gentlemen's, do. do. 3s. 8d. „

ALL PURE FLAX. **POCKET HANDKERCHIEFS.**

HEMSTITCHED. per doz
Ladies' 3s. 11d
Gents' 6s. 9d

"The Irish Cambrics of Messrs. ROBINSON & CLEAVER have a world-wide fame."—The Queen.

IRISH LACE. Collars, Sets, and Trimming Laces, in Crochet, Guipure, Appliqué, Point, and Limerick, at lowest wholesale prices. (Illustrated Lists post free.)

IRISH EMBROIDERY Ladies should write for our New Illustrated Sheets. Real Irish and Madeira Embroidery. Also

Machine Work: all Buttoned edges, on best cloth, from 2½d. per yard.

IRISH LINEN UNDERCLOTHING. Chemises, trimmed Embroidery, 5s. 6d.; Night Dresses, 8s. 6d.; Combinations, 6s. 11d.

Baby Linen, Dress Materials, Flannels, Blankets, Hosiery, Gloves, Undervests, Pants, Calicoes; also Lace and Linen Curtains, and Lace Goods of every description. (Price Lists post free.)

SHETLAND WOOL SHAWLS. "The Marvel," White, two yards square, post free 1s. 8d. each.

Pale Blue, Black, Cardinal, Pink or Grey, 1s. 10d. Write for Illustrated Sheets showing all qualities.

ROBINSON AND CLEAVER, Belfast. SAMPLES POST FREE. GOODS SHIPPED DIRECT TO ANY PART OF THE WORLD.

EDE AND SON,

ROBE MAKERS,

By Special Appointment,
TO HER MAJESTY AND THE ROYAL FAMILY
THE LORD CHANCELLOR, THE BISHOPS
CORPORATION OF LONDON, &c.

ECCLESIASTICAL AND UNIVERSITY GOWNS of every description.

LAWN SLEEVES, ROCHET AND CHIMERE.

Surplices for Clergy and Choir,

Hoods, Cassocks, Scarves,
Stoles, Bands, Clergy Collars,
College Caps, Band Cases, Sermon Cases.

FULL-SLEEVE GOWNS FOR PRESENTATION

PEERS', LEGAL, AND CORPORATION ROBES.

Established 1689.

94, CHANCERY LANE, LONDON.

ROYAL ASYLUM of ST. ANNE'S SOCIETY'S SCHOOLS, Redhill, Surrey (removed from Streatham Hill), for Children of Parents who have moved in a superior station of life, Orphans or not, of any nation.—CANDIDATES for the DECEMBER ELECTION must be NOMINATED ON or BEFORE Oct. 22nd 1885. Children are eligible between the ages of 7 and 12. Forms of Nomination and Lists of the subscribers, can be obtained at the Offices, 58 Gracechurch Street, E.C. SUBSCRIPTIONS and DONATIONS are greatly NEEDED, and are earnestly solicited by the Lord Mayor, Treasurer; Messrs. Dimsdale, Fowler, and Co., 50 Cornhill, Messrs. Barclay and Co., 54, Lombard Street, E.C., and by R. H. EVANS, Secretary.

SCRIPTURE READERS' SOCIETY for IRELAND.—Established 1822.
PRESIDENT—The Right Hon. the EARL OF SHAFTESBURY, K.G.
Offices: 27, Lower Pembroke-street, Dublin, and 9, Paternoster row, London.
Full particulars, Reports, &c., can be obtained post free on application to the Secretary, Capt. JAS. KEARNEY WHITE.

METROPOLITAN FREE HOSPITAL, KINGSLAND ROAD.
FUNDS urgently NEEDED for building and general purposes. Bankers—Messrs. Glyn, Mills, and Co., 67, Lombard-street. GEO. CROXTON, Secretary.
City Offices: 103, Bishopsgate-street Without, E.C.

CITY OF LONDON TRUSS SOCIETY, FINSBURY SQUARE.
For the Relief of the Ruptured Poor throughout the Kingdom. Established 1807.
Patron—H.R.H. the PRINCE of WALES.
The importance of this Charity to the suffering poor of both sexes and all ages may be gathered from the fact that 406,000 have been already relieved.
The proportion of aggravated cases to simple cases is larger than it was formerly; hence more expensive instruments are required, greater cost is entailed, and increased Funds are needed. Subscriptions and donations will be thankfully received by Lloyds, Barnetts, and Bosanquet's Bank (Limited), 62, Lombard-street, E.C.; and by the Secretary, at the Institution, 35, Finsbury-square.
JOHN WHITTINGTON, Secretary.

ROYAL MATERNITY CHARITY. Established 1757.
For Delivering poor Married Women at their own habitations.
PATRON: HER MAJESTY the QUEEN.

Anxious to extend the usefulness of this Old Charity to the many poor women hitherto unable to obtain its succour in their hour of trial, the Committee have been compelled to sell out funded property to enable them to issue a thousand Supplementary Tickets, trusting to the liberality of a generous public to make up the deficiency.
DONATIONS will be GRATEFULLY RECEIVED by Sir John Lubbock, Bart., M.P., 15, Lombard-street, or H. Fellen, Esq., 3, Wood-street, Cheapside, or the Secretary at Charity House, 31, Finsbury-square.

SCHWEITZER'S

COCOATINA,

Anti-Dyspeptic Cocoa or Chocolate Powder.

GUARANTEED PURE SOLUBLE COCOA, WITH THE EXCESS OF FAT EXTRACTED.

THE FACULTY pronounce it "the most nutritious, perfectly digestible beverage for BREAKFAST, LUNCHEON, or SUPPER, and invaluable for invalids and children."

Highly commended by the entire Medical Press.

Being without sugar, spice, or other admixture, it suits all palates, keeps for years in all climates, and is four times the strength of cocoas THICKENED but WEAKENED with starch, &c., and IN REALITY CHEAPER, than such mixtures, made instantaneously with boiling water, a teaspoonful to a Breakfast Cup costing less than a halfpenny.

Adopted as a Medical comfort in the Royal Navy.

COCOATINA A LA VANILLE is the most delicate, digestible, cheapest Vanilla Chocolate, and may be taken when other chocolate is prohibited.

In tins at 1s. 6d., 3s., 5s. 6d., &c. By Chemists and Grocers.

Sole Proprietors, H. SCHWEITZER and Co., 10, Adam-street, Strand, London, W.C

NOTICE.

The JOHN BULL may be obtained on the day of publication, at Messrs. SMITH and Son's Railway Book-stalls, or of any Newsagent, at 6d. per copy.

CHARGE FOR ADVERTISEMENTS.

Advertisements of Public Companies, 1s. per line.

General Trade Advertisements (Reduction for Series), 9d. per line.

Notices of Births, Marriages, and Deaths inserted for 3s. 6d. each.

Advertisements over Leader, 1s. per line.

N.B.—Advertisements from the country must be prepaid; sums not exceeding 5s. may be sent in stamps; above that amount in Post Office Orders, made payable at the FLEET STREET Money Order Office.

*** All Cheques and P.O. Orders to be made payable to E. D. MADDICK, 6, Whitefriars-street.

THE CHURCH CONGRESS.

(*Continued from Page* 671 *of* Supplement.)

CONGRESS HALL.—Wednesday.

The meeting in the morning was devoted to—

THE WORK OF WOMEN IN THE CHURCH—(*a*) AS SISTERS AND DEACONESSES; (*b*) RESCUE WORK IN TOWNS; AND (*c*) THE GIRLS' FRIENDLY SOCIETY.

Mr. John Pares, in a paper on the first branch of the subject, contended that the Scriptures contained sufficient references to warrant the agency of women's organisations in connection with the work of Christianity. The system on which sisters and deaconesses were appointed was sound, but they needed guidance and supervision. Their work in the way of nursing and visiting the sick and distressed was most valuable, whilst what they did in rescuing those who had fallen was inestimable. Their services in connection with the Church were becoming more and more appreciated, and it would be well if they were permitted to take a larger share in the work of the Church.

The Rev. Canon Thynne read a paper on "Rescue Work in Towns," in which he urged that it was from the religious rather than the political or the social side that the Congress must consider the subject. Here came in the work of women in the Church towards their erring sisters, and they must have clearly before them the distinction between crime and social purification on the one side, and their work—the rescue of souls from a life of sin—on the other. The criminal aspect of the case could best be dealt with by vigilance committees, but rescue work should be conducted with as little resort as possible to the aid of the criminal law. As to the form of work to be undertaken, he divided parochial or localised work into two great divisions—viz., work undertaken by those who devoted their whole lives to it either in homes or refuges, whether as "sisters," devoted workers, or mission women, and work undertaken by women living at home and giving some settled portion of their time to it. The advantages of the first form of work were its greater stability, affecting both the work itself and the character of those engaged in it, and the accumulated wisdom stored up by experience in the work; while the advantages of the second consisted chiefly in its greater adaptability with regard to expense, the freshness imported into the work, and the greater ease with which workers could be found qualified for such work. The considerations which should guide the selection of workers were pointed out, and finally Canon Thynne dwelt upon the spirit in which the work should be undertaken. It must be wholly religious. One would think it could never be forgotten, but in the whirl and pressure of details and experiences—and the late terrible scandals with all their tail of unsavoury consequences made details all too prominent and obscured principles—it was forgotten even by chaplains and clergy sometimes that the one aim of rescue work was to restore a temple of God, the Holy Ghost.

Mrs. M. E. Townsend read a paper on the "Girls' Friendly Society," which she said now numbered more than 115,000 women and girls of all ranks, ages, and occupations. It was the deep conviction that some such organisation was needed amongst those who were early obliged to go forth into the world that led to the founding of the society; and leaving to others the work of rescue and reformation, it had for the last eleven years steadily pursued its own special object—the preservation of purity. The work of the society began in the home, and it was strongly advised to enrol children as candidates for the society from eight to twelve years old. When a member went out into the world the society was able to give her introductions to safe friends, and if obliged to leave her native land she would find even in our colonies and America a friendly welcome from societies called by the same name, bearing the same mark, and pledged to the same foundation rules as her own. The society was open to girl workers of every class and occupation on the sole condition that they should always have borne a virtuous character, and that they desired to keep that character unstained. It made friendships in many directions, and its great common aim—the raising of the standard of womanhood—was a means of uniting classes which was not to be despised in these days. The Church in each parish should take up and use the agency thus provided to its hand. At present, in spite of the society's 750 branches, and the increasing strength of its diocesan organisations, the work as a whole was maimed and imperfect, because in one parish it was taken up heartily and with vigour, and in another it was languid or almost dead.

The Bishop of Oxford, speaking to the first branch of the subject—sisters and deconesses—remarked that there had been times when the mere mention of sisterhoods would have raised a storm about their heads. No doubt the best work which a woman could do for the Church was her work at home. This was all the more important, as the great question of the day was the sanctity of marriage, which was being undermined in foreign countries by insidious attacks of all kinds, which happily had had but little influence in this country. There were, however, many women who either had no sphere of home work, or in many cases had no home. The penitentiary, the hospital, the home, offered a sphere of work to such women. Admirable work was done by deaconesses in the diocese of Winchester, while in his own the beneficent labours of sisterhoods were widely known. He deprecated the spirit of controversy which had arisen between the two methods of organisation. Deaconesses and sisters were alike absolutely pledged to devote themselves to Christ's work. The necessity of reserve forces in the Church's army had been mentioned by Canon Thynne. In his opinion the Church wanted more enthusiasm, more self-sacrifice and self-forgetfulness, even at the risk of an occasional breach of proprieties. The presence of a quiet sisterhood often did more to reclaim sinners than more imposing agencies. The Church needed all her forces, and none of these forces would do more good work than bands of women associated for Church work.

The Rev. R. C. Billing, speaking with regard to rescue work in towns, entered a protest against that manner in which a well-known paper had recently made its disclosures. As to rescue work, it was essentially the work for women, and it ought to be made a part of the regular parochial system. It was desirable that the clergy should co-operate with the guardians and other poor-law authorities, who, his experience went to show, were always willing to accept the assistance of parochial clergy. He deprecated in the most emphatic manner anything in the nature of sensationalism.

The Bishop of Carlisle said the Girls' Friendly Society had done excellent work in his diocese. At a recent festival at Carlisle 1,200 girls, members of the society, were present, and he regarded that gathering as more effective than all the sermons of his clergy in promoting the cause of purity. To a young girl in a large town no greater boon could be offered than a home where she would receive motherly kindness, while the benefit conferred by the Girls' Friendly Society upon girls going out to the colonies was still greater. He urged ladies to help forward the work of the society by every means in their power.

The Rev. H. G. Athill (Diocesan Inspector of Schools, Winchester) pointed out the opportunities which existed for the Girls' Friendly Society doing great good in elementary schools through the mistresses. In the borough of Portsmouth that method was found to work admirably both in Board and Voluntary schools.

The discussion was continued by the Rev. A. F. Forbes (Southampton), the Rev. P. R. Braithwaite (Jersey), the Rev. R. H. Webb-Peploe (London), and the Rev. J. W. Sidebotham (Farnham); the Rev. Precentor Venables (Lincoln) and the Rev. R. Martin also took part in the discussion, which was closed by the President, who called special attention to the work of deaconesses, which, he said, was of a most valuable character, and ought to be encouraged in every way.

At the afternoon meeting the question of—

EVANGELISING AGENCIES SUPPLEMENTARY TO THE PAROCHIAL SYSTEM

was the subject of a paper by the Dean of Manchester, which began by giving an account of the parochial system, and proceeded to suggest several ways in which the system might more effectually meet the needs of the time. The first need of the parochial system was redoubled energy on the part of the clergy and laity in the work of education. The maintenance of Christian training in our Elementary schools was not only necessary, but should be supplemented by every means direct and indirect. Our Sunday schools must take a new departure and recast themselves in order to meet the needs of the coming time. There must be improved children's services; they must utilise and enliven the Lord's Day; there must be guilds and associations of all kinds to make Christian relationship practicable to the poor; and they must attach the young to the parish and the Church. With regard to the Church Army he expressed a hope that it would avoid the extravagance of doctrine and practice which had proved the snare of the Salvation Army, on which it was admittedly founded; and that it might steadily maintain that reverence was not a question of taste but a question of principle. Such enterprises as the Church Army, and he might add also the admirable mission work of the Church of England Working Men's Society, and the older-fashioned district visiting associations throughout the country were the necessary expression of the true sense of Church fellowship, and of the responsibility of the Christian laity for each other's welfare both in soul and body. But they did not exhaust that responsibility. The parish, however, ministered to more than this by witnessing to the true constitution of nature as body, mind, and soul. The parish priest's human jurisdiction had a moral and spiritual significance. The Christian minister was attested by it as the minister of the whole man, charged with the application of Christian principles to all the relations of human life. He denied that the minister was sent with a message only to the souls of men. The parish was really an assertion of this great principle; it regarded and treated its parishioners not as immortal spirits only, but as human beings; not as so many souls, but as men. It put questions to the limits of ministerial duty and ministerial influence out of court. It was co-extensive with human life and human duty. Parochial life, and therefore ministerial responsibility, touched politics, art, literature, business, recreation, human progress, and the whole social welfare and elevation of the people.

The Rev. W. Carlisle explained the origin and operations of the Church Army. With the appalling need that the Church had around it, with the threatenings that were made against it, with a yearly addition of over 400,000 souls to provide for, he asked was this a time for Churchmen any longer to regard with suspicion or coldness this supplementary agency, which had resulted in the conversion of so many of the lowest? The Army wanted open doors in town and country, for without the invitation of the vicar they would not go. They wanted suitable persons as candidates for their training home; they wanted University men and others to live and fight with them for a time against sin in the slums. Where Church Army methods were efficiently worked vast masses of the people would not only swell the number of the redeemed, but would also bring down inestimable blessing upon the Church.

Mr. R. Foster, Mr. H. A. Colville, the Rev. C. M. Owen (who advocated the claims of the deaf and dumb upon the Church), Mr. Stephen Bourne, the Rev. C. G. Wilson, the Rev. F. S. Webster, and others continued the discussion; and in summing up, the Chairman pointed out that the parochial system of the Church of England was elastic enough to contain all the various organisations which had been spoken of, and which co-existed in the various parishes without any clashing whatever. The parochial system in itself was not sufficient to cope with the steady increase of the population, and the sudden growth of population in particular districts. The attacks which had been made for years past upon the deepest mysteries of our religion had aroused an enthusiasm on the part of those who believed in our Lord which was spreading from one end of England to the other, and these various agencies were springing up as the results of that enthusiasm. He and those amongst whom he worked recognised that enthusiasm as one of the most precious gifts of the present day. The work of the Church of England at the present moment was and still must be more and more aggressive, and he thanked God for the work which the Church Army had done in his diocese. If they could strengthen that and other agencies, there would before long be a marvellous power in the ranks of the Church of England.

In the evening a working-men's meeting was held in the Congress Hall, which was crowded to its utmost capacity. An overflow meeting was held in St. Thomas's Church, at which the Bishop of Carlisle, Mr. Beresford Hope, Canon Venables, and Archdeacon Emery spoke.

LECTURE HALL.—Wednesday.

The morning meeting was devoted to the consideration of the subject of—

RELIGION AND ART—THEIR INFLUENCE ON EACH OTHER.

Mr. J. D. Sedding read the first paper:—

What is religion to man? Religion is the sum of human aspiration, the motive of benevolent energy, the source of enthusiasm, and the spring of comfort. Without religion life would be intolerable, and the world a school of despair. Religion is the motive and force of righteousness in the world—it supplies the creed by which a man shapes his conduct; it opens out the spiritual world; it sweetens even the saddest life, and forms the saint.

What is art to man? Art is the embodiment and the communication to men and angels of man's thought about Man, Nature, and God. It is man's way of decorating his existence, and of declaring the glory of God and of ministering to human delight. Art is both the need of man's nature and its highest product.

Look through the world's history and you find that man has ever been an artist or a promoter of art. Even in savage tribes the artistic instinct reveals itself in the adornment of things that are regarded with love, or fear, or veneration. Art thus becomes the voice for the imaginative qualities of a race—and a voice so definite in its typical manifestations, that the expert need not be told the origin of a piece of art brought to his notice. Even if it be of remote antiquity, there is a certain mark about it—a type of form, a pattern that recalls dead symbols, a trick of handicraft perhaps, by which its source is traced home.

And the art of a race is not only its imaginative voice, but by the force of some subtle law, it becomes the key to the dominant traits and to the conditions and sentiments of the people. For instance, the history of the terrible Empires of the ancient East is told in concrete form in their gruesome art. The weird faith, the boundless conceits, the cruel might and majesty of grinding Pharaohs, is all fitly told in the colossal imagery of Egyptian art. It is of the elemental, gigantesque sort. Our soul cowers down in its grisly presence. So, too, the fair Greek temples, built upon a sunny height like the Acropolis of Athens or Corinth and enriched with sculptures descriptive of the brilliant myths of nature, indicate the free life and vigorous, joyous temper of the race. So, too, the buildings of old Rome, that seem like vast mountains haunted with mighty shadows, remind us at once of the masterful grip and proud sway of the "ruler of the nations."

But art, like a diamond, has many facets. It is also the outward signs of all the interpretative and apprehensive power of man in his contact with material things. It has to illustrate and interpret nature as well as national history and human character. And this work goes forward by the very effort of man to convey his thoughts and emotions to others; for he uses the familiar sight and sounds of nature as a language they cannot fail to understand. Hence architecture, music, and painting are all based upon natural phenomena; and even poetry employs picturesque natural images to express heightened thought. But, while nature is the mine of art, the artist puts his own superscription upon the coinage he makes out of Nature's wealth, and does not simply imitate her.

The underlying imitation of nature in art is seen in the art of music which is allied to the music that is everywhere in the world—in the waves of the sea, the rustling leaves, the songs of birds, and the murmur of happy living things. You see it in architecture, whose primal suggestion is the cliffs, and the groves, and the houses of animals. You have it in sculpture and painting, whose *motifs* are the graceful forms and aspects of natural things. In these ways art leagues itself with nature. Yet the artist is no mere copyist. He creates anew; he idealises; he transcribes the natural music in the process, but transposes it into a key louder than any nature knows. He never feels alone and unacknowledged when in the presence of natural phenomena—the flowers, the water, the hills, the sky—all speak to him and beget emotions. And the record of these emotions, in which he imbeds his sense of the secret bond between the external and the spiritual worlds—"the sense of tears in mortal things," as Mr. Arnold puts it—calls up that selecting, harmonising, genius in man which makes that thing we call "art."

You know that God makes the artist. In common parlance he is *born*, not made. He gets his credentials straight from Heaven. Hence his special gifts. For his eye can see deeper, his ear hear more, his heart is sooner thrilled, his speech is sweeter, his imagination is more alive, his sympathies in better tune, his mind is calculated to receive physical impressions more exquisitely, and he apprehends in "hours of insight" more truly than other men the beauty and meaning of visible things. This is why we hail the artist as God's mediator between nature and man. This is why we proclaim him priest in God's universe by the grace of God, and see around His head the aureole of a Divine commission.

By his divine craft the priest of harmony can draw such celestial sweetness and such spiritual store out of a succession of musical tones, that our hearts fill with devotion and our eyes with tears. "I have but to play Schubert's 'Ave Maria,' or Beethoven's 'Adelaide,'" said Hector Berlioz, "to draw every heart to myself and to make each one hold his breath."

By his divine craft, the priest of form can fold in one the magic in nature and in art—he can steal nature's seal and print it upon his work—he can put the glamour of the woods into his roofs and aisles—he can bring the might of the tall cliffs into his walls, and can entice the soul of the tangled thicket into the mazes of his carved and hammered work, and can dispose God's house with such profound religiousness of surroundings that you get a strange thrill of expectancy as you enter, and say, involuntarily, "Surely the Lord is in this place!"

By his divine craft the priest of line, or colour, or expression (the sculptor, painter, poet) can call hidden marvels out of familiar things; can draw pathos out of each human face, aye, and out of each bird and brute's face; and can preach attractive sermons on the mystery of life, nature, and the Infinite. "What!" exclaims dear William Blake, "what, it will be questioned, when the sun rises do you not see a round disc of fire somewhat like a guinea? Oh, no, no! I see an innumerable company of the heavenly host crying 'Holy, holy, holy is the Lord God Almighty!'"

See, then, the influence that religion and art have on each other. To speak of one is to include the other. They run like warp and woof in the woven fabric of human history. If art is an instinct in man, so is religion. Man has an instinct for worship, a thirst for revelation. And where revelation is withheld, man sees the apparition of God in nature—in the balanced clouds, the storm, the mystery of being in living things. By their alluring beauty and their witness to God's care and majesty, these details of nature proclaim God. And here art comes in, for the thinking men of old must clothe their thoughts and emotions about the Almighty in tokens and symbols suggested by the wonders of Creation.

We Christians call classic art "profane"—and a good deal of scorn is wrapped up in the phrase—and the art philosopher looks at Greek art as but the ideal of the best brains of a sensuous race. Yet his art is the vesture of the Greek's faith. It expresses the omens of his gods. The beautiful imagery is more than it seems, for between its lines you read the Pagan's confused thought of the Infinite, and you hear his cry in the dark for the complete light of the knowledge of the glory of God in the face of Jesus Christ.

"But I must pass on." The old Oracle said: "All things have two handles. Beware of the wrong one."

Now, when St. Paul preached on Mars-hill, the Parthenon was in full view. There, crowning the Acropolis, shining in all the lustre of mellowed white marble backed by a blue sky, stands the building which was at once a treasure-house of religion and of art—a building that was eloquent of the piety, the culture, the splendour of Athens in her best days. There, encircled by fair temples and gods,

> Thick as autumnal leaves that strew the brooks
> In Vallambrosa,

stands Christ's ambassador, to say that God dwells not in toil-wrought temples, but in the eternal temples of His own creation. Pointing, as he spoke, to Phidias' matchless bas-reliefs and to the gods around, he declares that there is a Saviour, and that these images could not be semblances of Him, and could not be worshipped.

The question we have here, is, then, not so much the *extent* of allowable relation between the Christian religion and art, but the propriety of any relation between them whatsoever. Are we to understand that the Christian is not to record any incident in Christ's life by graven imagery? Is art to have no place in the Christian Dispensation? Is the Christian religion to be taught only from the pulpit and not from the walls? Is the zealous preacher to greedily monopolise the deliverance of Christ's Gospel? Is the Christian to be all ears and no eyes in the House of Prayer? Is the tragedy of the Cross to find no place in a Christian church? May we not picture the Son of Man on Blessed Mary's breast, or in Joseph's workshop, or in the haunts of men, or treading the way of sorrows? Is there then no tenderness, no condescension in the system of Christian teaching? Is there to be no pictured array of heavenly lookers-on, to cheer fainting, footsore, wayworn humanity, as it treads its *Via Dolorosa*? Is no pictured assurance of angelic tendance, of a bright home beyond the stars, and of Jesus' everlasting love for little children to be allowed?

It was not that Christianity discouraged art, but that she denounced idolatry and vice. It was not that the art of Phidias—either for its mythical meaning or for its ideal handling of that most lovely of all material objects, the human form—was condemned. Far from it. "All great art is praise,' says Mr. Ruskin. It was not that Pagan imagery, so far as it gave utterance to pious faith, displeased the God, "whose delights are with the sons of men." For, just as the Holy Spirit took the imagery of Phœnicia and Assyria at the heathen hands of Hiram of Tyre for use in Solomon's temple, so did He let the early Christian use Pagan imagery that had prophetic meaning in it.

It was not that temples made with men's hands were wrong. Our Lord has taught us to be jealous for the honour of God's House. Nay, was not the Parthenon itself dedicated to the Blessed Virgin in the fifth or sixth century; and did not the Pantheon of Rome (where Raphael was buried) become in the seventh century the Church of All Saints? It was not that images were wrong, so long as the graving of art and of man's genius did not rob God of the worship of His creatures. Life was serious enough in all conscience to the early Christians, yet they habitually practised art to clothe their faith, and the symbols they used turned in their hands into flowers that could brighten their lot and sweeten even the blood-stained recesses of the Catacombs. And so, from the dawn of the faith and right onwards, religion finds art her most powerful auxiliary, and imagery is everywhere freely pressed into her service.

But, again, let us "beware of the wrong handle" of the subject. Two cases, subsequent to this alluded to, show religion and art in collision. First, when on account of a superstitious use of images, Leo the Isaurian and a Council of Bishops decreed that all images should be placed at such a height in churches that they might be seen, but not be accessible to the ignorant people. The second case is the outbreak of Puritanism, which in England cost us all the goodly imagery of our churches.

The Second Commandment forbids the worship of likenesses of God and the making of the likeness of any mortal thing for worship. But it is not *images*, but their *worship*, that the Council of Frankfort and the English Church forbids. Jesus Christ became man that we might read God in His face, His words, and acts. He took flesh that we might look into His face and read His character. And, if "the Word made flesh and dwelling among us" may be pourtrayed at all, you will agree with me that, as a matter of principle, you cannot exclude any part of His earthly life and ministry from the sphere of art. It is a case of "all in all or not at all." Concede the sculptures,

Nativity, or the miracles, and the crucifix needs no apology or defence. Nay, one would say that if one thing more than another should be conspicuously portrayed in every Christian Church, and should be held as most helpful to the ministry of reconciliation, it is that event which, in our Lord's prophetic words, should be faithful in drawing men to Him in proportion to the prominence of its exposition. One would say that if one object could speak straight to men's hearts of the guilt of sin and the need of atonement, it is the figure of love, strong as death, thorn-crowned and pierced to the heart, upon that cross which is both tree of life and tree of shame.

The second case touches Englishmen nearly, for it robbed us of our best native art treasures, and brought about that divorce of religion and art we so much deplore at the present day.

I said at starting that art is necessary to man. Yes, and the Puritan, too, must have his imagery. If he hacks down the Rood, he retains the skull and cross-bones at its foot. If he defaces the Mother and Child, he keeps the cherubs that had carolled in their ears, and only alters their expression. If he banishes the imagery of life eternal, he coins an image of death in the shape of an hour-glass, which is useful in the pulpit. If he hews to pieces the Christ and the holy men of the New Dispensation, he sets up the "schoolmasters" of the law to flank the Ten Commandments. Not that his mind was quite easy. In the preface to Beza's *Icons; or, Portraits of Illustrious Protestants* (published 1580) the author defends himself against any imputation of idolatory or image-worship, on the plea that these Icons were not to be introduced into God's House. Ah! "there's the rub!"

With these exceptions the Puritan's relation to art was of a destructive, and not of a constructive, character. He would have no dealings with art at any price. He broke down the fittings of our churches, turned them into barns, whitewashed their painted walls, threw down our marble altars and set up deal tables instead, burnt the coloured vestments of our clergy, and clothed himself from top to toe in a fitting suit of sable. Art was to him inimical to spiritual devotion, and a concoction of Satan. Milton, in his earlier days, had indeed spoken with the tongue of an angel of the sweet and solemn influences of Anglican worship; but the developed Puritan scorned the sacredness of places and things.

Holding such views, it was impossible for the Puritan to be other than an iconoclast. For art works objectively, while his religion is subjective, art is genial and expressive, where Puritanism is ungenial and repressive. Religious art expresses the enthusiasm of belief, and can no more thrive in doubt than a wall can stand in sinking sand; but the Puritan is a man of anarchy and doubts. Axe in hand, he grimly arraigns the Christianity of the past, condemns it all, and proceeds to efface its memorials. The Puritan's is a gospel of gloom, that checks all joy and heart-affluence. On the other hand, the English Church, at her best times, has pressed into her service all that is eloquent and expressive in the best part of man. True it is, that here, as elsewhere, the Catholic Church has her Puritan side in services, architecture, and worship. She can sing low as well as high. She can, if need be, strip and sell the silver from her altars to feed the poor, and can build stern churches. But, systematically she takes man as God made him, and deals with him on that entirely rational principle that religion is made for man, and not man for religion. Her endeavour is to make his human nature plastic to Divine influences; so she finds fields for his faculties and his emotions. She invites him to rear churches that are sanctuaries for God and homes for men—churches garnished with lovely imagery, churches which the poor may be happy in and the little child may love—churches which shall not be whited sepulchres for torpid audiences, but homes of grace whose religious surroundings shall foster holy thoughts and minister to the sanctities of mortal life.

You may remember some stern mountain-range that you once saw in a foreign land that stood black and frowning against the sun and barred the warmth and light from the valleys and homesteads beneath. How cold and dead was the scene! But you got to the other side of the black wall to find the uplands aglow with light and heat. Man and nature were alive, the trees waved, the flowers smiled, the streams flashed, the birds sang, the children played, the gaily-dressed men and women carolled cheerily as they toiled in the fields.

Need I explain my simile? You know too well how the shadows of Calvinism rested on well-nigh half of the Church of England in the dreary days before the Catholic revival. You know what state art was in. You know how Calvinistic teaching had chilled our youth, turned our homes and churches into icehouses, made our social and religious life mawkish and repellent, our schools purgatory, our hospitals and "poorhouses" scarcely human. But one by one, or in small devoted bands, from this side and that, like a tale of romance, came chosen men to beat down peak after peak of the icy barriers that kept out the sunlight—Handel, Beethoven, Charles Wesley with his hymns, Goldsmith, Scott, Lamb, Dickens, Wordsworth, Newman, Keble, Arnold, Maurice, Kingsley, Father Lowder, Liddon, Reynolds, Landseer, Turner, Millais, Dyce, Hunt, Rossetti, Jones, Browning, Tennyson, Pugin, Ruskin, Butterfield, Street, Shaw, Pearson, Bodley—each hero wielding his craft to batter out his little breach in the wall, and make a fresh track for sunbeams to warm the frozen roots of humanity and make the flowers blossom once again about our altars and our homes. Yet how much remains to be done! See how art and religion are still estranged!

Has it ever struck you that, with all our bright galaxy of astists, our objective art is *all* "profane," or *without the temple!* In other days and other lands it was not so. The Greek's best art came straight to the temple of his gods. Luca della Robbia's, Luini's, Michel Angelo's, Murillo's art was essentially *God's* art and the *people's* art, that came to the old trysting-place of God and man—the temple which was common land to rich and poor. The church walls were covered with frescoes and easel-paintings and sculptures that had sway over men's hearts, and charmed them to the side of religion. The Bible and the lives of the saints were open fields for the artist's genius. He made life full of sacred presences, and, as men knelt to pray, they felt the eyes of Christ and the saints and angels and the whole court and company of heaven upon them. You tell me that the artist was often a bad man. *Was* he! But if mediæval society were as bad as Machiavelli described it—if the Pope was a fiend, and if all the devils of Inferno danced obscene orgies round the artist's easel, they fouled not his art. His art was Divine. He held orders from above. Divine beauty haunted his mind, and drove him like a goad. He was in touch with heaven as well as with earth. Hence it was his to embody the beauty of holiness and the godlike glory of redeemed humanity for those about him; for you and me, and for all generations. The times might be bad, and there might be villainy in high places; but the artist, in Christ's stead, taught hope and courage by the triumph of the saints. He gave enthusiasm to the toilers, told men of their Divine destiny, and helped to make life lovely and happy.

And if "happy-making" art were needed in days when nature was unspoilt and toil had joy and recompense in it, who shall say England does not want it now? For the face of English society is smeared all over with defilement: the wear and tear of existence increases, and the conditions of life are well-nigh unbearable. The smoke hangs over six counties. The green fields fade yearly farther away from the children's feet; and men, women, and children lie huddled together in our hideous towns in one dark, surging mass of misery and crime, hunger and despair. Yet priest and artist make no sign; they do not bring beautiful pictorial art to the churches where beauty can alone be seen by the poor man without inducing either envy or despair. The children of the courts are left to feed their souls upon the *Police News* portraits of distinguished criminals and pictures of their crimes; or upon the local undertaker's painting of a suburban cemetery and funeral, and the elegant coffin adorned with a rustic cross that graces his shop-window!

They say that English art is revived! Yes, revived for selfish ends and to minister to godless culture and vulgar wealth! In other days religion and art—like twin-sisters—went hand in hand; but now, each wends her way companionless and mistrustful of the other. I do not say that the fault is primarily the artist's. I say that the Puritan forged chains for the artist, and the clergy go on riveting them. The Puritan would not have pictorial art in church, and the clergy seem determined to perpetuate his superstitions. You know that the English Church is the best fenced Church in Christendom, and so admirably hemmed in with cast-iron restrictions, that, according to the *doctrinaire* arm-chair Churchman and the cute and creedless lawyer, you may not put a sculptured image of your Saviour on the Cross in church unless accompanied by the two thieves to spoil the devotional effect. See how the Puritan's malison rests upon us, and are you surprised that the nineteenth century artist (who can get rich without the Church's patronage) should resent your churlish behaviour, and scorn both you and your prejudices. Depend upon it that the devil is right glad to see your church doors barred against the possibilities of pictorial art for drawing souls to Christ. The French infidel knows the power of the Crucifix; its power to touch the loving heart, and reach pain, sorrow, and sin.

And art suffers as much as religion from this estrangement. The artist is truant from God. He lives for art only, and sips the nectar of existence without caring for its deeper interests. The great stream of religious life which you and I have found so refreshing rolls by him, leaving him untouched, uninspired. In popular estimate he is the poor trifler of an empty day—one with a thrilling mission to revive obsolete dress—an expensive purveyor of mild stimulants for sluggish imaginations—one with a vocation to paint coroneted babes and fashionable men and women—a man to sculpt "dirty boys" and marble soapsuds, or birds in cages after the Chinese manner.

Even the higher side of English art has little sincerity of purpose; it only echoes the fashionable doctrine of future extinction. It shows delight in woman's charms; it has movement, colour, dress, passion; it is keen in the sense of enjoyment, but, scratch its skin, and you find underneath the old Pagan lament of the brevity of life. Divine revelation might be an exploded fiction; the Church might be in the ravening jaws of Hell; God might be dead, for aught you learn of these themes upon Academy walls!

A noble painting by a great artist was placed the other day outside a Whitechapel church, but its theme is Mother Death striking a youthful victim. I was at its dedication, and, what with the picture, the speeches, and the elegy upon defunct Christianity delivered by our master of elegy—Matthew Arnold—I felt that it was all like a solemn farce where Christianity assisted at her our obsequies! If *that* is the best the clergy can do for the witness of Christianity upon church walls, and *that* the best that a great living artist can do in that line, then we must wait till things mend.

And the pity is, that we *must* have modern religious art. Old pictures may be advantageously copied for educational purposes, but not for devotion. The old-world air in them is fatal to their general attractiveness. Each age must write its own religious books, and paint its own religious pictures. The old art is pitched in an old key, and won't suit. Hunt's "Light of the World" or Millais's "Carpenter's Shop" is worth a score of £70,000 Raphael's "Madonnas" to nineteenth century Christians. Not that old pictures have yet done their work for God. You remember how Robertson, of Brighton, was resigned to his sufferings and drawn to his daily task by the face of Da Vinci's "Christ" at the foot of his bed. It was only the other day that a friend saw two men looking at an autotype of a Crucifixion by an old master in Oxford-street, and one said to the other, "I s'pose Bill, that be the Saviour on the cross; well, I never know'd it was like that!"

The practical question for us, is, can we Churchmen do anything to heal the breach between religion and art, and draw the forces again to the Church's side? Have you no commissions to offer for the vacant roods in your churches? Will you not claim that a figure of Christ upon the Cross shall be reared upon the screen at Westminster Abbey, to redeem the utterly Pagan aspect of the place? We are looking anxiously for the decoration of the dome of St. Paul's, but is there not room for Holman Hunt's pictures in the chapels and aisles? Are there no dead walls in our Cathedrals and parish churches to be made alive by bas-reliefs and paintings! Are there no pillars on which to hang easel paintings—no dreary church walls to make resonant of gospel truth? (that is if the clergy will allow that they do not *quite* exhaust the Gospel's charms in their discourses). Have you no trumpery "Ecclesiastical Art" reredoses—concocted of baked-mud tiles, British stones, and scrabbled monograms that no one understands—to replace with a good picture or sculpture?

Let me tell you that it is only the parson and the chance archæalogical squire who care for spic-and-span *dilettante* Gothic churches that are as neatly pointed but as voiceless as a tomb! The peasant, the artisan, the farmer, the little child, does not care a dump for them, nor yet for hideous antiquated ninth century saints that "conventional" artists outline on your walls; nor for the highly correct but particularly ill-made saints in your stained-glass windows! I asked a man who was staring up at some ghostly ghastly paintings in a London church what his impression was of them: "Well," he said, "I think they are curious"—and so do I! In old days the poor man who "took a turn" round your unrestored church could at least find a little human interest in the monuments, but you have left him neither a skeleton, nor a weeping cherub, nor a skull and cross-bones, nor Maud's "Angel watching an Urn"—not even the Lion and Unicorn a-fighting for the Crown.

Believe me, the poor *do* care for pictures and sculptures in churches. "For the learned and the lettered"—says an old Spanish writer—"written knowledge may suffice; but for the ignorant what master is like painting!" You put religious paintings and crucifixes in your homes, your schools, your mission rooms, and mission chapels;—why exclude them from your churches? If you cannot afford to employ living sculptors and painters, call the immortals of old days to your aid. Get Arundel Society pictures, autotypes, coloured prints from the Religious Tract Society, or S.P.C.K., or the National Society.

Art is, in no sense of the word, an equivalent for religion. Pictures cannot save men or turn this naughty world into Paradise. Yet it is God's way that art shall bring happiness to man, shall educate his spiritual intelligence, shall give strength and elevation to his character, produce hallowed emotions, witness for the faith, make religion more close and more lovely to man, and help to lead him to the throne of God, where all His servants shall see His face.

Mr. Palgrave, Mr. J. C. Horsley, R.A., and Mr. W. J. Courthope also read papers on the subject.

Mr. Beresford Hope, M.P., in opening the discussion, remarked on the wonderful consent of views in the papers they had just heard. Mr. Sedding's paper was clever, lively, and bristling with epigram—it was an art production in the way of poetry rather than a work of history. Religious art centred in and around the crucifix. In the church in which he had taken much interest they had a crucifix in high relief, and he knew that there was in preparation by a prominent artist a large crucifix for St. Paul's Cathedral. There was a great deal of religious art which was mere frippery, and in secular art there was much frippery, and something worse. But they had won many points, so that they might now do many things that a few years ago were impossible.

Canon Hoare differed from Mr. Beresford-Hope. He had not won the victory. He might have put a crucifix in his own church, and he might have heard that a crucifix was to be placed in St. Paul's Cathedral, but that was not a victory. A few people might admire it, but the great body of the English nation deplored it. ("No, no," and cheers)——

The Chairman (the Dean of Wells): I can have no interruptions.

Canon Hoare, continuing, said these were not the days to split up the Church of England. It was not safe to drive a wedge through the heart of the Church of England. He did not hesitate to say that they could not weaken the Church in the minds of the great body of thinking men more than by the reintroduction of crucifixes and images into the Church. He did not come there expecting to hear the image question discussed. He regarded it as a very low type of art. Thank God the reformers swept with a firm hand the images and crucifixes out of the Church of England, and he hoped with his heart and soul that they never would be seen in them again. They had been told that Puritans were averse to art. Some people might call him a Puritan and a Calvinist. He did not mind. They were not averse to art, but they liked it in the right place. There was a use and a danger in it. Take the case of Church music; the perfection of the music destroyed worship.

Mr. Melville Green observed that if art was to be the handmaid of religion it must be intelligible.

The Rev. A. J. Robinson (Whitechapel) thought that too much was made of art as a refining influence on the working classes, but he never knew a man cease to black his wife's eyes because he had been looking at pottery. Looking at pictures and pottery did not touch men's hearts. He deprecated the introduction of crucifixes into our churches.

The meeting was also addressed by the Rev. E. R. Christie, the Rev. R. Randall, Messrs. J. J. Bourne, F. J. Candy, &c.

In the afternoon the Dean of Wells introduced the subject of—

THE CATHEDRAL IN ITS RELATION TO THE DIOCESE AND THE CHURCH.

The history of our Cathedrals is, I fear, little else than the record of ideals unrealised, large resources wasted, the *corruptio optimi*. The Deans in Chapter were meant to be the free electors of the Bishop, and we have the *simulacrum* of the *congé d'élire*. They were to be the permanent guardians of the temporalities of the See, and their confirmation of the Bishop's acts in the appointment of permanent officials, chancellors, and registrars has been given and received as a thing of course. They were to be the chief advisers of the Bishop, acting under his fatherly guidance, and their Chapter Acts are full of disputes as to their respective jurisdictions, and he has preached or read the commandments in his own Cathedral only by a patronising sufferance. They were to be models of an unworldly life, nursing a high standard of devotion, and Deans and Canons came to be as they are painted in the *Chronicles of Barchester*, and non-communicant singing men, and ill-cared-for boys, lost, in their round of services and anthems, the very capacity for worship. Their rich endowments were to be the rewards of learned labour or pastoral zeal, and too often Dean Law's answer to to the Cathedral Commissioners in 1850,* has been applicable with fatal truthfulness. "In our own Cathedral (Wells) there is no notice upon record of any services being rendered to learning, or of any appointment being made for other considerations than politics or family." They were to be centres of educational activity† (this was specially the idea of the Cathedrals of the New Foundation), and not a single Cathedral school, as such, has risen to any eminence comparable with that of Rugby or of Harrow. They were to be centres of evangelising mission work, and their record till lately has been a blank. Lazarus has lain for centuries at the gates of the Cathedral Dives, and is as "full of sores" as ever.

One may note from time to time efforts after better things. The collegiate Cathedrals of the old Foundation aimed at a higher standard of culture than that of the older abbeys. The Precentor was to maintain the musical element of worship at its highest point. The Chancellor was also the Archischola, and was to superintend the general education of the choirboys, as the Precentor did their musical instruction and of the younger vicars choral. The ideal of a vicar's life was that he was to study as well as sing. Canons were to be ready to undertake public burdens and labours for the common benefit of the Church.† How the system worked in pre-Reformation periods I have not time to discuss. Chaucer has left us no portraits of a Dean or Canon, and it may, perhaps, be scored to their credit that they did not go on Canterbury pilgrimages.

With the Reformation there came a great change in the work required of the Cathedral staff. Instead of daily and manifold masses, and the round of services from prime to compline (priests and choir boys rising often at midnight‡), there were simply matins and evensong, and weekly—too often only monthly—communions. That would have been the time for a keen and searching reform, reducing the staff, assigning definite new duties for the old ones that had lapsed, largely expanding the preaching and educational activities. The opportunity was not used, and the result was that there were more idle hands, with the inevitable "mischief," as result. Cases of intemperance and worse, of quarrels and contumacy, thicken over the Chapter Acts. Elizabeth tried to enforce habits of devotion and study by the somewhat strong measure of forbidding the wives and children of Deans, Canons, Prebendaries, and vicars choral, laymen as well as priests, to reside with them or even elsewhere in the Precincts.§ Her Commissioners (Jewell being one) tried to develop the educational idea by making it the duty of all the vicars choral, or singing men, to "resort into the Gramer Schoole.‖ The Canons of 1604 feebly required that the "petty canons and the vicars choral should have at least a Latin New Testament," which it was assumed that they could read (*Can.* 42). In other respects the remedies prescribed by the Canons throw light on the nature and strength of the disease. Deans were to reside not less than ninety days in the year (*Can.* 44). Residentiary Canons were only so far tied to residence that they were not to leave the Cathedral without one of their number, a condition which in many cases might have been satisfied by less than two months. They, and the Canons, Prebendaries, and other officers, lay or clerical, were to receive the Holy Communion four times a year, and on "principal feast days" the "principal minister" was to officiate in a cope (*Can.* 24). It was the last feeble attempt at a fair day's work for what were certainly a fair day's wages. The clean sweep of Parliamentary and Cromwellian rule, 'memorable for having called forth' in Hacket's speech before the Long Parliament (1641) something like an ideal of Cathedral life, as well as an *apologia*, was followed at the Restoration by a reaction in which Deans and Canons seemed to have learned nothing but the art of accumulation, and forgotten nothing but the fact that there was an ideal to strive after, and a work to be done. Deaneries were held with bishoprics, canonries in two or more Cathedrals, with one or more livings. The Crown, not content with its own patronage, encroached, under the Stuarts, by letters of provision, on that of Chapters who co-opted, and the appointments were not seldom scandalous.¶ The one check upon the wide-spread plague of plurality was the cost of keeping up so many establishments. Here and there, indeed, even before the days of Cathedral Reform, the breath of the evangelical revival had found its way, as in the instance of Milner and Ryder, into the seclusion of the precincts. But, taken as a whole, the Cathedral system of England had borne no fruit meet for repentance under the Georgian *régime*. The question might have been asked, "Can these dry bones live?" The sentence might have gone forth, "Cut it down: why cumbereth it the ground?"**

During the last fifty years there has been a great change, in which we, who come to reap where others have sown, may thankfully rejoice. It is well to consider how that change was brought about. Not, be it noted, by any high ideal or elaborate legislation. The Cathedral Reform of 1836-40, the work of the Whigs and Sir Robert Peel, backed by Archbishop Howley and Bishop Blomfield, was simply economic. To get rid of the more glaring abuses, reduce the sinecures, and transfer the money that had been wasted, to the spiritual necessities of towns and villages—this was their rough and ready rule. Such a reform seemed to Peel "possibly the last opportunity" of averting a destruction otherwise inevitable. Protests on behalf of an ideal of some kind came (names strangely matched) from Sydney Smith, Mr. Gladstone, Dr. Pusey, and Mr. Hope Scott,†† but passed unheeded. The result was, perhaps, all the happier. What the Cathedral fig-tree needed was a vigorous pruning, and that it got, and though it bled and groaned in the process, it gained a new strength. What had been the minimum of four Canons at Carlisle became the normal, almost Procrustean standard. And among the dry bones (you will pardon me if I mix my metaphors) there was a stir and shaking, and the breath of heaven came from the four winds—Evangelical and Catholic revivals, popular demands, Broad Church intelligence—and gave life where before there had been but the skeleton fragments of a forgotten and lost ideal. Evening services in the nave, more frequent Communions, Theological Colleges in Cathedral cities, more activity of Deans and Canons in the good works of the Cathedral cities and the diocese, began to multiply. Public opinion has compelled Prime

* See the Archbishop of Canterbury's speech at Diocesan Conference 1885. (*Guardian*, July 3), and Bishop Warburton's on Crown Appointments in his dedication of his *Divine Legation* (B. iv.-vi.), as quoted by Dr. Pusey (*Remarks*, p. 12).

* See Cranmer's proposal for establishing Readerships of Divinity, Greek and Hebrew in each Cathedral. Burnet's *History of Reformation*. B. III., A.D. 1540. See also the *Reformatio Legum Eccles.*, as quoted by Pusey (*Remarks*, p. 139).

† See Statutes in Reynold's *Wells Cathedral*, pp. 45, 55, 56, clxxvii. Dugdale's *St. Paul's* app. 11, 36.

‡ Reynolds, *Wells Cathedral*, p. clxxxiii.

§ Reynolds, p. clxxxvi. ‖ Ibid, p. clxxvii.

¶ Thorndyke's wish that Cathedrals might become "schools of the prophets, seminaries of preachers," deserves to be noted as an exception to the general apathy.—*Primitive Government of Churches, ad fin.*

** It is only fair to refer the reader to a moderately long list of divines of eminence connected with Cathedrals given by Dr. Pusey in his *Remarks*, pp. 104-105.

†† See Sydney Smith's *Letter to Archdeacon Singleton*, Pusey's *Remarks on Cathedral Institutions*, and Mr. Hope's *Speech before the House of Lords*. It is worth noticing that Dr. Pusey dwelt chiefly on the plan of utilising cathedral foundations for purposes of theological study (pp. 73-80), Mr. Hope on their being the councils of the Bishops, and centres of preaching activity (pp. 61-65). One of Dr. Pusey's remedies was to transfer all Cathedral patronage to the Crown (p. 84).

Ministers and Bishops to make on the whole respectable appointments, some on the "reward," some on the "learned leisure" theory. The Cathedral is beginning to have a hold upon the affections of the people, in proportion as it has recognised its duties to them, such as it has not had since the Reformation.

There are, of course, drawbacks, rising out of the absence of the ideal element in the Cathedral Reform, of which I have spoken. Three months' residence (and in some Cathedrals, as in York and Chester, there is only one house for the four Canons), is not enough to connect a man adequately with the life of the city in which he is a sojourner. His life as a Canon is subordinate to his other work, and that work, on its side, is more or less marred and interrupted by his residence. Attendance at services, and, at the outside, thirteen sermons, present but a scanty record of work done, in the absence of duties as yet unassigned, though not always unperformed. Such an arrangement is obviously fatal to the idea that the Chapter is to be the Bishop's council of advisers.

We have been led during the last four or five years to the threshold of another great reform, based on more ambitious lines, avowedly aiming at a far higher ideal. I wish I could persuade myself that it is likely to pass into the regions of actuality. There have been magnificent conceptions, long parturient labours, the actual birth of some twenty-four Cathedral infant constitutions; but there they lie, out in the cold, burked and blocked by Parliamentary procedure, not, I fear, within a measurable distance of practical politics. I may hope or fear many things from the new constituencies who will vote in November next. The one thing of which I cannot persuade myself is that they will return members who will show a tender care for the interests and activities of Cathedrals. It would be entirely out of place, I think, if I were to attempt to profit by the chance of being the first reader, where I ought to be the second or third, and to discuss the schemes of the Cathedral Commission in the presence of the Right Rev. Prelate who is to follow me. Those schemes have been obviously dominated by the ideal set forth by the present Primate in his volume on *The Cathedral*, and realised with a marvellous rapidity at Truro. I gaze on that ideal with sympathy and admiration. I should like to see the Chapter as the Bishop's council; truth, wisdom, light flowing out from the Cathedral, like the river in Ezekiel's vision (ch. xlvii. 1-12), or the streams in my own fair city of fountains, each man with a work assigned to him, and doing it, not with eye service or a grudging statutable minimum, but in a genuine singleness of heart. But when I turn to the documents in which the idea is embodied, I confess they seem to me to be constitutions that have been made and have not grown. When I read of the workers at Truro, my heart burns within me. When I read the statutes, luminous and voluminous, of its Cathedral, I ask, Will it march? What guarantee is there of its permanence? Will it escape the fate of past reforms? What is to be done if the Bishop declines to consult his Chapter, or the Chancellor Canon does not lecture, or lectures unprofitably, or the Evangelist Canon is a man without the gift of unction or of prophecy?

Do I, then, despair of the future of our Cathedrals, or content myself with the Cassandra utterance of one who sees "rocks ahead"? Far otherwise than that. So far as I can feebly act myself, so far as I can advise others, my counsel would be, "Do not depend on legislation. Do not wait for it. Be content for the present with the day of small things. Prophesy once more to the four winds, and bid them breathe life into whatever in ourselves and our systems has become ossified and dead. Invite preachers from within and from without who have the gift of utterance. Let special services for children win the rising generation of our future masters to feel that the Cathedral is their home, that there, at any rate, they can find a "free and open" Church. Revive the other services so that they may be musically and otherwise, not by Act of Parliament or Episcopal decree, but by their own completeness, the standard of ritual to the diocese. Let each member of the Cathedral find in the history of the past and the opportunities of the present that which shall prompt him to higher aims and more resolute activities. Let the Dean be as the father of his choir boys, and the Chancellor see that his schools are efficient and well organised, and the Precentor do his best to make the choral element of worship, in the highest liturgical acts as well as in daily worship, in the hymns, which win the hearts of the people, as well as in the anthems, which satisfy the expert, as near perfection as may be attainable. Where there is a theological college, let the Cathedral dignitaries do what they can to help its students. Let Prebendaries and Honorary Canons remember that the distinction of which they are justly proud involves also the duties of brotherhood and co-operation. Let all alike remember that the people of the Cathedral city, and of the diocese, are, in the truest sense, their neighbours, and have the first claim on their thoughts, time, and money. If we do these things, then, with or without Acts of Parliament, we shall make our Cathedrals a praise and glory in the land, instead of a bye-word and proverb of reproach. For each and all, there is the counsel which Ælfric of York gave of old, as a master to his scholars, *Esto quod es*—"Be that thou art."

Archdeacon Hannah, who read the next paper, confined himself to the task of vindicating the claims of learning to a prominent place among the obligations of Cathedral bodies, as at least equally important with the discharge of administrative functions; at least equally compatible with the maintenance of a high standard of worship; and at least equally useful both to the diocese and to the Church at large.

The Bishop of Carlisle was inclined to look upon the brightness of the present rather than upon the gloomy picture drawn by the Dean of Wells. At St. Paul's Cathedral a vast amount of spiritual work was going on; perhaps comparison would place it at the head of the long list. His experience of Ely was equally satisfactory. As chairman of the Cathedral Commission, he would remark that the essential conception of a Cathedral body in olden times was diocesan parochial clergy in residence; but in the modern foundations the original conception was lost in a college of priests, whose duties were confined to the Cathedral itself. The idea of the reform of 1840 was confiscation rather than the fulfilment of Cathedral duties. The Cathedral Commission, appointed at the instance of Lord Beaconsfield, called for reports on each Cathedral in lieu of general recommendations, not applicable in all cases. In this report he acknowledged the discernment of Lord Beaconsfield. The recommendations of the Commission (some of which he read) would restore the diocesan character of the Cathedral and impose duties on the Canons; and he believed that these duties would be discharged if they were made statutory, and that suitable men would be appointed. The day of nepotism was passed—the day when the Chapter consisted of the Bishop's sons and sons-in-law. The proposals of the Commission were within the range of practicable politics, and would commend themselves to the common sense of the new Parliament.

Mr. Beresford-Hope, M.P., gave a further account of the proceedings of the Commission. The account the Cathedrals had to give of themselves was a creditable and illustrious one. Much that was recommended might be carried out by by-laws and orders and the Chapter exercising their constitutional privileges.

The Rev. Canon Venables said that a Cathedral might be made useful to the clergy of the diocese for many purposes if the Bishops were more identified with the Cathedral.

The Rev. Dr. Cross thought it inexpedient, when Disestablishment was in the air, to revive the remote past of the Cathedrals. Better talk of the satisfactory present.

The Rev. Prebendary Dumbleton thought the Cathedrals had a future before them if the clergy made them centres of common labour, prayer, and consultation. The Canons were too few for the public labour of the diocese.

The Bishop of Southwell said his See had no past, good or bad. The Cathedral was in a village. In what way could it be made to work for the benefit of the large towns? Could a Cathedral be a centre of work without a population?

The Rev. Canon Kirkpatrick, of Ely, said the question might be asked, How came that fine Cathedral to be in a village? It was for the glory of God, to whom it should constantly witness for the whole diocese.

The Bishop of Winchester said the Bishop of Southwell started a difficult question, which the last speaker had tried to answer, giving comfort, if not entire satisfaction. He had often wished Ely Cathedral was in a large town; but still there had been fine congregations and services there. He was thankful for the report of the Commission, particularly for the recommendation that the Cathedral should be a centre for the Bishop. He would gladly give his patronage into the hands of the Dean and Chapter. It would be a pleasure to relieve himself to some extent of responsibility by consulting a council. The honorary Canons should be no longer honorary, but should be prebendaries or non-residentiary. When there were only four or five Canons, if some were old and others ill, the work of the diocese could not be done. The parishes should be connected with the Cathedral and the clergy all come to it. If good men were appointed to the Cathedrals, they were capable of doing valuable work.

In the evening the meeting considered—

THE RESPONSIBILITY OF THE CHURCH WITH REGARD TO EMIGRATION.

The Bishop of Newcastle occupied the chair, and introduced the subject. It was clear, he said, the Church did not do her duty if she did not assist the emigration of those who would be benefited by it. Christianity had to do with the present, and was bound to concern itself with the welfare of the body as well as that of the soul. With the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel and the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge looking after the spiritual interests of emigrants, the Church and the clergy might co-operate, not in promoting emigration, but in diffusing information to guide those likely to make successful emigrants. He was prejudiced in favour of emigration to our colonies. We wanted our sons and brothers to be sons and brothers still. A great preventive work was to be done by the Church in promoting the emigration of children. The future of the English-speaking race in our colonies should stimulate the Church to do its utmost to direct emigration to the attainment of the best results.

The Hon. Mrs. Joyce and the Rev. J. F. Kitto, rector of Stepney, also contributed papers, after which there was a long and animated discussion, in which a variety of suggestions were made.

A second evening meeting in lieu of one at the Congress Hall, given up for the working-men's meeting, was held at the Lecture Hall to consider—

THE DOCTRINE OF HOLY SCRIPTURE AND THE ATTITUDE OF THE CHURCH WITH RESPECT TO WAR.

The subject was introduced by the Rev. Prebendary Row:—

The first thirty-six years of my life constitute the longest interval of peace which has been enjoyed by the European nations since the downfall of the Roman empire of the West. Such was the effect which was produced on the public mind by the twenty-one years of war which followed the First French Revolution. I do not mean that this interval was free from internal struggles which resulted in a certain amount of bloodshed, but that during that time there was no formal declaration of war by one nation against another. But during the interval of peace, another generation, who knew nothing of the horrors of war, and were dazzled with its so-called glories, had grown up; and the result has been that not only have several terrific wars broken out which most of my hearers can well remember; but the Christian nations of Europe have gone on so increasing their armaments, that at this moment of nominal peace little short of 5,000,000 of armed men are ready to engage in the work of mutual slaughter. Let it be observed that this is about ten times the number of the forces which were maintained by the Roman Empire at the height of its power; yet it was a military heathen monarchy, while the nations of Europe are the professed subjects of the King of peace.

It cannot be denied that this is a state of things which urgently demands the attention of the Church of God. How comes it to pass that since the conversion of the nations of Europe to Christianity they have been engaged in a continuous state of warfare, only interrupted by very brief intervals of peace? Does Christianity speak on this subject with a faltering voice? Can it be that the Church of God has been doing its duty respecting war during the centuries of the past? Let us hear the teaching of its founder:—

"Blessed are the peacemakers, for they shall be called sons of God," "All ye are brethren," "Put up thy sword into its place," "Love your enemies, and pray for them that persecute you, that ye may be the sons of your Father who is in Heaven."

Let us hear His Apostles:—

"The Gospel of peace," "The God of peace," "The fruit of the Spirit is peace," "The God of peace himself give you peace at all times in all ways," "Love one another from the heart fervently," "He that loveth not knoweth not God, for God is love." "Where jealousy and faction are, there is contention, and every evil deed."

It surely must be a work of supererogation before a Christian audience to extend my quotations. Every reader of the New Testament cannot fail to perceive that its underlying principle is peace, and that it affirms it to be the duty of the Church, and of every individual Christian, to promote peace always and in all places. In truth, the teaching of the New Testament is more opposed to war than to slavery; for while its fundamental principles are utterly subversive of the latter, yet it contains no precept directly condemning it, while both its spirit and its letter are condemnatory of war. Why, then, has the Church succeeded in subverting slavery? Because it has boldly pronounced it to be inconsistent with Christianity. Why is it that all it has effected with respect to war is to diminish its barbarity? Because instead of denouncing it in the name of the King of peace it has spoken with a hesitating voice, and even not unfrequently taken it under its patronage. With the exception of certain efforts during the Middle Ages to restrain the work of mutual slaughter by proclaiming what was called "the Truce of God," it has too often blessed its weapons, consecrated its standards, and thrown the halo of religion over the chivalrous knight who, while he acted with all courtesy towards his brother knight, bathed his sword without pity in the blood of the townsman or the peasant, and has even sung, for so-called victory, *Te Deums* to the God of peace.

Yet what is war? Let some of the great battlefields of modern Europe speak. Hundreds of thousands of Christian brothers arrayed for the work of mutual slaughter. Thirty or forty thousand lying dead on the battlefield. Double that number wounded. Vast numbers destroyed by disease. Whole districts ravaged. The worst feelings called into active energy, and all the ameliorating influences exerted by Christianity and the course of civilisation stopped. It would be easy to enlarge this terrible list; but it involves what, to the Christian, ought to be more terrible still, in that it becomes the duty of Christian brothers in opposite armies to do their utmost to kill one another. It has often occurred to me that their meeting in the unseen world must be a strange one. But this is even far from being its worst aspect, if Christianity is true. What, viewed in its light, is the meaning of glorious victory? The sudden hurrying of thousands of human beings, while animated with the fiercest passions, into the presence of their God. Let each who hears me consider for himself what this means.

My position therefore is that warfare, as it has been practised among Christian nations, is in direct contradiction to the teaching of Christ and His Apostles, both in its letter and in its spirit. But let me not be misunderstood. I do not affirm that all wars are unlawful. There is nothing incompatible with Christianity in a war which is really and truly defensive, for a nation has as good a right to protect itself against invasion as individuals have to protect themselves against burglars. I use the words "really and truly defensive" because nothing is easier than by the aid of a little sophistry, by playing on men's fears, and by standing up for what is called "prestige," to metamorphose any offensive war into a defensive one. Do not think that I undervalue "prestige;" but let it be the "prestige" of exhibiting in our political, social, and individual capacity the principles of Christianity. This will do more to consolidate our Empire than all the prestige of force or military glory.

I shall be doubtless told by many that the idea of acting on the principles of the New Testament is no better than in a visionary dream. I have heard it said that if we were to do so, our national greatness would be gone: India would be in revolt, and the tradesman would be ruined. To argue this point with an unbeliever would occupy far more than the space which can be assigned to this entire paper. But with him who professes to acknowledge that the work and teaching of Jesus Christ is not of man but of God, I can deal very summarily. Jesus Christ claims to rule supreme over the conduct of every Christian, whether it be in his political, social, or his individual capacity. To say that this is impracticable, is to deny the validity of His claim, and, therefore, the truth of His mission.

I have already said that I defend a war which is really defensive, on precisely the same principle that I would not hesitate to fire on a burglar who entered my house at night, supposing I could do so safely. Nations often have been and are no better than burglars. Such burglars have been no small number of Kings, Emperors, and even Republics. But let us be careful that the war we are going to wage is against a real political burglar, and not one of our imaginations and our fears; for Christian nations have been only too ready to manufacture such. But in all the usual occasions which impel me to war, it is the duty of a Christian nation to exhaust every means to pursue peace before it draws the sword, for at best war is a great calamity—God only knows how great. I think, however, that the Church of the fourth and fifth centuries went beyond the requirements of the Gospel in subjecting every soldier on his return from battle to penance before admitting him to the Holy Communion. Gibbon charges this as one of the causes which contributed to the fall of the Roman Empire. That fall, however, was occasioned among its other numerous vices by its most oppressive system of finance.

But I shall be asked, what have you to say about the Old Testament? Does it not justify the warlike spirit which you affirm that Christianity condemns? Has not the Song of Moses the words "The Lord is a man of war"? Has not one of the Psalmists written, "Blessed be the Lord my strength, who teacheth my hands to war and my fingers to fight"? and is there not much more even in the Book of Psalms to the same effect; in a word, is not the spirit of the Old Testament thoroughly warlike? I answer that it is even so. But the supposed applicability of its moral teaching to Christian times is founded on an entire misapprehension of the relation in which it stands to the New. Our Lord affirms in the Sermon on the Mount that he came not to destroy the Law or the Prophets, but to *fill them up full—οὐκ ἦλθον καταλῦσαι ἀλλὰ πληρῶσαι—i.e.*, to realise the true moral idea which underlay them, and by so doing to sweep away all the imperfections of their utterances.

Before expressing my own views on this subject I must draw your attention to a very remarkable work of the late Canon Mozley, entitled *Ruling Ideas in the Early Ages and their Relation to Old Testament Faith.* It was originally a course of lectures delivered to graduates in the University of Oxford, in his capacity of Regius Professor of Divinity in that University. Strange to say, although this is one of his most remarkable works, and one which everyone who undertakes to expound the Scriptures of the Old Testament ought to be acquainted with, it is one of the least known. I by no means wish to commit myself to all the Professor's positions; but there are numerous points in this book which every student ought to meditate on, to enable him to understand the relation in which the teaching of the Old Testament stands to that of the New. Dr. Mozley clearly perceived that the old mode of dealing with these subjects was no longer tenable; he, therefore, lays it down as a general principle, that in these days of enlightened Christian conscience it would be impossible to accept as of Divine authority a command to perform an action directly contrary to its dictates, even if that command were sanctioned by a miracle. In such a case it would be our duty to disregard the miracle and to obey conscience. In accounting, therefore, for certain precepts in the Old Testament, he lays down the all-important truth, too often disregarded, that the revelations therein contained are progressive revelations, specially adapted to the condition of the people for whom they were designed, and accommodated to the low moral condition of the times. Consequently, he admits that there are commands in the Old Testament which no command given in these Christian days would justify us in carrying into execution, not even if they were sanctioned, to use the Professor's own words, *by a miracle*—I would say, by a pretended miracle; or directed by what a person deemed to be an express revelation.

A simple illustration will make Dr. Mozley's position clear. Supposing a person professing to have a Divine commission were to come into this room and order me to kill the chairman, and were to sanction his order by the performance of a miracle; in such a case, I am bound to obey the dictates of my Christian conscience, which pronounces the killing of an innocent man a crime, and to disregard the miracle. With these general principles as laid down by the Professor I cordially agree, although we widely differ respecting the nature and evidential value of miracles, as may be seen in our respective *Bampton Lectures.*

But how about the commands to slaughter whole nations, including women and children; the ordinary Jewish law of war, which authorised the destruction of every male; and the practice of any extent of lying towards an enemy? The two first of these have been attempted to be vindicated on the ground that the Author of Life has the right to recall His gift whenever He pleases; and that it is the same thing whether He does it by an earthquake or by human agency. His abstract right to take life cannot be denied; but, as the Professor most justly observes, there is a wide difference between the employment of a moral agent to take life and the blind forces of nature, which are destitute alike of volition and morality. His general position may be briefly stated as follows.

The moral sentiment in these early ages was low and the times barbarous. Many an act which is considered a crime now, was not considered a crime then. Among these were numerous cases of bloodshedding for which the perpetrator in this Christian country would certainly be hanged; but which in those times were esteemed just and lawful. The cause of this was that in the ancient world there was a total absence of the recognition of the rights of the individual. Thus the whole family, including wife, children, and slaves, were viewed as the property of its head, and were not considered to have a single individual right, not even to life. This being so, vengeance took the form of massacring a whole family, and even of exterminating a whole tribe, in requital for an offence committed by some ancestor. Further, the practising of any amount of deceit towards an opponent was viewed as just and lawful. The moral sentiment in these early days being thus degraded, the Professor considers the moral teaching of the Old Testament, and even certain Divine commands, to exterminate whole nations and families to have been an accommodation to it. In a word, the rights of the individual as distinct from those of the head of the family or tribe were unrecognised until the latter time of the Jewish dispensation, and those of enemies not until Gospel times.

The facts, as stated by Dr. Mozley, respecting the low moral ideal of those earlier ages are, I think, undoubtedly true, and that the Jewish dispensation is an accommodation to it. The fact that its legislation and practice allowed, nay commanded, many things which are inconsistent with the teaching of Jesus Christ, is affirmed by our Lord Himself. On this point I will express myself in Professor Mozley's own words. I only regret that time prevents me from reading to you the whole of his Fifth Lecture.

"The law," says he, "tests itself." Does the enlightened conscience condemn anything that it allows or commands? It ceases to belong to the law; it goes, "Ye have heard that it hath been said of Old Time;" all these precepts are the *litera scripta*, of the law; they are there in black and white; statute law, as good as ever was impressed on any code. But it all goes from the original assumption which overrides every particular statute, that now nothing but what is perfect is allowed in morals. "Be ye perfect even as your Father that is in Heaven is perfect." If there is anything that is a falling short—which goes a certain way, but not the whole way, as in the imperfect law of marriage, in the imperfect law of love, and in the law of retaliation—it is assumed that the essence of the law is not all this; and that, on the other hand, what is perfect is the law. We know nothing from henceforth but this perfect law commanding in the conscience.—(P. 105).

Having travelled thus far pleasantly with the Doctor, it is with regret that I must express dissent from several of the conclusions which he draws from these premises. It seems to me that his principles fail to meet those cases where what are apparently express Divine commands are alleged as the justification of acts which Christianity condemns as immoral. I can fully understand these utterances on the assumption that Moses and the Prophets possessed such a degree of Divine enlightenment as was necessary to qualify them for that work to which they were Divinely called, and in virtue of this enlightenment, and of their Divine commission, that they prefaced their utterances with the formula, "Thus saith the Lord." An example will illustrate my meaning. In Exodus xxv. 9, Moses is directed to make the tabernacle and its furniture according to a pattern showed him in the Mount. Yet the whole of the following chapters to the thirty-first contain a number of directions respecting the construction of the Tabernacle and its furniture of the minutest description, each direction being introduced with the words, "The Lord said unto Moses." I assume, therefore, that this formula is used because Moses made them according to the Divine model, and not because he subsequently received a specific direction as to the position of every nail and every plank; for, otherwise, the order to frame them according to a model previously shown him is unintelligible. This principle I therefore apply to those utterances of the Old Testament which represent God as expressly commanding acts to be performed which are contrary to the spirit and the teaching of Jesus Christ. I assume that in these a human element of some kind has most assuredly entered.

That such human elements entered in the utterances of the Prophets, the utterance of Agabus recorded in the Acts of the Apostles affords positive proof. Having bound his own hands and feet with Paul's girdle, he says: "Thus saith the Holy Ghost, so shall the Jews at Jerusalem bind the man that owneth this girdle, and deliver him into the hands of the Romans." We are, however, informed by St. Luke that the Jews did not bind Paul, nor deliver him bound into the hands of the Romans; but, on the contrary, that they tried to kill him, and that the Romans, seeing the tumult, came down, took him out of their hands, and by the order of their commander bound him with two chains; and we are subsequently informed that the Jews complained before Festus that Lysias, with great violence, had taken him out of their hands. It is true that the Revisers have placed this last passage in the margin, as though it was of doubtful authority; but it is difficult to conceive what could have induced any scribe to insert it, whereas it is easy to account for its omission. Whether genuine or otherwise, it does not affect the facts as stated by the historian.

The details, therefore, of Agabus's utterance were not realised. I assume, therefore, that he was only authorised to warn Paul of his danger; and the particular form of his utterance was a human element apparently framed on the expectation that the Jews would pursue the same course with St. Paul as they had with our Lord—viz., deliver him bound as a condemned criminal into the hands of the Romans. I apply this principle, therefore, to those utterances in the Old Testament which command acts to be performed which are contrary to the teaching of Jesus Christ and to the dictates of the conscience enlightened by that teaching. Among

these surely must be reckoned wholesale slaughters of men, women, and children, of the latter of whom the Saviour certainly said, "Suffer the little children to come unto me, and forbid them not, *for of such is the kingdom of God.*"

Respecting the supposed command to exterminate the Canaanitish tribes I need say but little, for I find such a command recorded only in one solitary passage in Deuteronomy. In every other place the injunction is to *drive them out*. In Exodus xxiv. and elsewhere the hornet is described as the instrument by which three of these tribes were to be expelled. Moreover, they were to be driven out gradually, to prevent the increase in numbers to enable them to inherit the land. But the case of the Gibeonites proves that the direction was not understood as a command utterly to exterminate those nations, for they obtained a treaty of peace by a deception so gross that it is impossible that Joshua and the elders could have viewed their oaths given under such circumstances so far binding as to supersede a direct Divine command. Yet their submission was accepted; and the remark is subsequently made that none of the other Canaanitish tribes offered to do so. It seems to me, therefore, that their national destruction and not their extermination was the intention of the command. So St. Stephen also seems to have viewed the matter. "Whom," says he, "God drove out before the face of our fathers."

It is impossible that I can accept Dr. Mozley's elaborate attempt to vindicate the act of Jael even on his own principles, for her act of treachery and falsehood was one far below the imperfect morality of the times. No miracle was wrought to justify it; no command was given. Why, I ask, is it necessary to attempt to vindicate such an act as this simply because in Deborah's war-song she is called "Blessed among women"? Which is the more probable, that this song is an utterance expressing the feelings of the triumphant Deborah, or that such an act of deceit and treachery even in the most barbarous times received the commendation of the Spirit of truth and love? The same principles are applicable to all similar cases, such, for example, as the act of Ehud, and are their only adequate explanation. Ehud even added to his act of treachery the words, "I have a message from God to thee;" and on hearing this, apparently in reverence, Jabin rose out of his seat, on which followed the act of assassination. I fully agree with Paley that to make Christianity responsible for its life for everything which is recorded in the Old Testament, is to place a wholly unnecessary burdens on the shoulders of its defenders.

My hearers will perceive that it is simply impossible to deal with such a subject as the present in a manner which is satisfactory to them or to myself in the space of twenty minutes; all that I can do is to drop hints, which will be of wide and general application. Let me, then, offer one more as an aid to the solution of this difficult question.

There are only two ways of getting rid of moral evil—viz., either by conversion or by extermination. In these early times the idea of conversion was unknown. It is not even hinted at in the earlier books of the Bible. Zealous opponents of evil, therefore, had no weapon with which to combat it but extermination. Their idea was, that in doing this they were identifying themselves with the cause of God. Vengeance on wickedness, they thought, if executed at all, must be executed in this life; for there are only two passages in the Old Testament, and these belong to very late times, which contain a direct reference to a judgment to be executed on sin beyond the grave. From this ignorance originated no small number of the deeds therein recorded, which are repugnant to our Lord's teaching. "Happy shall he be," says one of the Psalmists, "that taketh and dasheth thy children against the stones." Yet not all of them breathed this fearful spirit, for another Psalmist says, "I am for peace, but when I speak unto them thereof they make them ready for battle." How like is this to the spirit manifested by multitudes of professed Christians in this our day.

In conclusion, I have only to observe that, however we may explain the encouragement given to bloodshed in the pages of the Old Testament, which, with a few trifling exceptions, pervades its pages, the whole has vanished away with that dispensation, and that it is now the duty of the Church and of every individual member of it to proclaim, both in season and out of season, that God is the God not of battles but of peace, that the fruit of the Spirit is peace, that the Christ of the Gospels being the moral image of God, every act, whether of nations or of individuals, which is repugnant to His character, is not of God; and that Blessed are the peacemakers, for they shall be called the *Sons of God*. This duty is pre-eminently incumbent on the members of a Church, who weekly, perhaps daily, approach God, as "O God, who art the Author of Peace and Lover of Concord," and who ought not only to pray, "Give peace in our time, O Lord," but to do everything in their power, in their political, social, and individual capacity, to promote it.

Papers were also read by the Rev. Dr. Edersheim, the Rev. Audrey L. Moore and the Rev. D. Trinder, and a discussion followed.

CONGRESS HALL.—Thursday.

The subject for discussion in the morning was—

THE TEACHING WORK OF THE CHURCH: (*a*) EXEGESIS OF SCRIPTURE; (*b*) DOCTRINE AND ETHICS; AND (*c*) CHURCH HISTORY.

The first paper read was by the Rev. Canon Westcott, who observed that every period of spiritual movement was also a period of fresh study of Holy Scripture. It could not indeed be otherwise. The Bible, to speak summarily, was a manifestation of eternal truth under temporal forms. We could not, therefore, rest in the sense which, as we supposed, the record had when it was written or which it had for us now, as final and absolute. We must take account of the moral and spiritual endowment of the time before we could determine the meaning of narrative or lesson for ourselves. The Divine teaching came through the letter, but it was not identical with the letter. Proceeding to define the work of the Christian interpreter in the present age, the reader pointed out that the variety, the vastness, and the intense practical interest of the questions which forced themselves upon teachers who strove to read the Scriptures in the light of modern thought were so great that no one scholar could deal with them all. If the Church was to fulfil its work of interpretation it could only be by a careful organisation of all its forces, by enlisting in its services all its members who were able to bring to the common cause the results of disciplined and devout study. Could, then, anything be more natural than that in each diocese some provision should be made for systematic instruction of the people in the higher knowledge of Scripture? We were in no less real danger from ignorance than from vice, and he could see no reason why the whole scholarly force of a district should not be made available for every part of it. What should we gain by this large and laborious effort, this grave addition to the toil and care of men burdened already with serving? We should, he believed, gain exactly what we needed most in a time oppressed by earth-born anxieties, by restless questionings, by the vague demands of modern speculations. We should learn a little more of the greatness of the scale in which God worked, of the infinite patience with which His counsel was carried to its issue before our eyes. We should learn, from the majestic freedom of the Divine Kingdom, to emancipate ourselves from the transitory dominion of material standards. We should learn that the whole Bible was a living book; not a quarry from which human builders could hew at their will stones to build shrines for their own idols, but one temple filled throughout with the presence of God; that theology was not sterile or unprogressive, but a science which moved with the accumulated advance of all the sciences when it was placed in its due connection with all life, not by the access of any new facts, but by the better understanding of the one fact to which all Scripture points in prophecy or in application.

The Rev. Prebendary Stephens (in the absence of the Rev. Dr. Wace) read a paper, in which he maintained that the only sound basis of Christian ethics was and always must be Christian doctrine. The doctrine of the existence of a living God, who was in direct personal relation with His Church, was pre-eminently calculated to quicken the action of conscience; and the moral standard was most likely to reach its highest level where the conscience was most sensitive. Moral philosophy could define virtue, but it could not produce the motive power which could make men practise it. Then, again, the doctrine of the incarnation strengthened the moral force of Christ's human example. Were He only a faultless man He was a man so unlike ourselves in all the conditions of His life that exhortations to imitate Him might sound like an idle mockery of our impotence. The chief ground on which He claimed the love and obedience of men was that He had come not merely to exhibit an example of perfect life, but that by virtue of His Divine Power and abiding presence in His Church He could assist in its attainment. The doctrine of the incarnation and the doctrine of original sin were closely linked together, and a belief in them was at the very foundation of Christian ethics. The only safe guarantee for the preservation and healthy development of Christian morals was to be found in the careful custody of the faith out of which they originally sprang. A higher type of morality could not be produced by the natural process of evolution, but must be built not in the shifting sands of sentiment and imagination, but on the solid rock of the creed of the Catholic Church.

The Rev. Canon Creighton followed:—

The Church has unrivalled opportunities for teaching. Few lecturers on any subjects can boast that they have such large audiences so continuous in their attendance as has the average clergyman of the Church of England. Twice in every week he has it in his power to instruct a congregation, which is, as a rule, eager to be instructed. Moreover, he has little difficulty in forming, besides, classes for continuous teaching on definite subjects. It may be doubted if the largeness of these opportunities is sufficiently realised, if the subjects chosen for treatment are sufficiently varied, and if they are taught in a sufficiently systematic manner.

The object of a clergyman's work is, broadly speaking, twofold—to evangelise and to edify. What he says on each occasion ought to depend on the nature of the congregation which he addresses, and should, as far as possible, be adapted to their definite needs. One great use of parochial visiting is to give the clergyman a knowledge of the actual life and actual problems of those to whom he speaks. Congregations sometimes complain that this knowledge is not adequately used; that sermons are preached which are above or below the level of their comprehension; that there is a perpetual sameness in the discourses to which they listen week after week; that one class of mind only is in the preacher's view; that there is no progress, no development, no change in his teaching. A dull uniformity of subject and of method is deadening to the attention. I wish to plead in the first place for a variety of subjects to be recognised as falling within the scope of a clergyman's teaching, and secondly, I would urge that Church History is one subject which is worthy of occasional treatment.

The chief reasons on which such a claim is based are these:—

(1) History is a vast storehouse of practical illustrations of every sort of truth. Abstract lessons become more weighty when they are enforced by reference to actual facts. The Old Testament is largely historical, and is concerned with the life of the Jewish Church. It teaches by example, and encourages us to pursue a similar method for ourselves. The influence of Christianity upon the world, its effect upon individual character, its power to overcome evil, all these things are necessary parts of the training of those who are bidden to shine like lights in the world. The Christian minister is bound to pay some attention to the records of experience concerning the truths which he inculcates.

(2) The teaching of history has a distinct place in the development of the spiritual life. An article of the Creed of Christendom is "the Communion of Saints." It is not well that any, even the simplest soul, should be left ignorant of the consolations contained in that inspiring belief. Every Christian heart should beat higher at the thought that the path along which he is advancing has been trodden continuously by countless feet ever since his Divine Master summoned mankind to walk in His ways. The records of the triumph of faith are every day being largely increased. The doctrine of the Communion of Saints gains in significance as the ages pass by. An inspired writer could find encouragement to patient perseverance in the thought of the "cloud of witnesses wherewith he was encompassed." I do not know that the trials of faith have been increased since the Epistle to the Hebrews was written; but the encouragements to faith have been multiplied by manifold examples. Time has shown the power of the Gospel to renew man's life and give it power and beauty amidst the most varied and the most untoward surroundings.

(3) The Christian is bidden to give a reason for the faith that is in him. God has decreed that history should take the place of miracles, that the Church should be a standing proof of God's presence within her. Special arguments are needed to meet special difficulties; but to the ordinary man, no evidence is more convincing than the actual facts of the working of the power of God unto salvation. As teachers of the people, as bound to combat error, the clergy can neither supply to others, nor use themselves, any more powerful argument than the call, "Come and see what God has done for men's souls." At all events, they do well to make this argument as complete as may be before they cast about for another. Christendom is the proof of the truth of Christianity.

(4) There is a great need at the present day that the history of the English Church, its position and its relations to the State, should be clearly understood. Popular ignorance supplies a ready field for misrepresentation. I am afraid that the clergy are in some measure to blame for this ignorance. It is to be hoped that they will take timely steps to state the historical facts accurately and soberly. The means towards this end will be discussed in another meeting of this Congress. I only mention it here because it forms an integral part of my subject.

(5) I must ask your indulgence if I step into wider considerations, where my opinions may be more open to dispute. I have no particular dread of the tendencies of the present day as being more dangerous than the tendencies of any previous time. But every time has its weaknesses and its dangers, though it is perhaps presumptuous to attempt to weigh those amongst which we live. The dangers of the present day do not so much spring from ignorance as from half knowledge. Every man thinks himself bound to have an opinion on every subject, and every man's opinion is weighty. There is a tendency to catch at what is novel and plausible, rather than to seek out what is true. The era of industrial progress in which we live seems to be so entirely self-contained, that the warnings of the past are little heeded. Men's energies are almost exclusively directed to material well-being; there is little room for imaginative aspirations. Our age is full of hopefulness; but it also has its dangers. Those dangers, all will agree, would be diminished if there was greater sobriety of judgment, a larger view of the course of human progress in the past, more sympathy with the imaginative element in man, a truer sense of the limitations within which abiding work must slowly be wrought out, fuller respect for the foundations on which all social systems must rest. Such qualities of mind are eminently fostered by a knowledge of historical development. The old proverb, "Rome was not built in a day," contains an echo of the historic experience of a united Christendom. I do not think it is a proverb much in vogue at present. I am sure that our own time would not have invented it. But I am also confident that thoughtful men of every shade of opinion would admit that an extension in the popular mind of the sense of historical continuity would be a most valuable addition to the political training of the people. A clergyman who undertook the teaching of Church History as part of his parochial duty would deserve the thanks of all good citizens, as well as all good Churchmen.

I have said enough in the way of urging the claims of this subject upon your consideration. I pass on to suggest some of the ways in which Church History might be more largely taught.

(1) The history of the Church supplies materials for apt illustration of almost any subject which a preacher may select for a sermon. Exhortations are always more persuasive when enforced by practical examples, and examples are more intelligible as they more nearly approach the experience of the hearer's own life. Personal anecdotes without names or references are often trivial, and sometimes sound as though they had been invented for the purpose. Definite references to definite facts of history, sayings recorded by accredited writers, attract attention at once, and often suggest to the hearer a desire to know more about them. I do not advocate a number of such like references to be strewn here and there through the course of a sermon. One is enough at once, and it should be made definite and precise; the actual facts should be explained if necessary. It should be treated, in fact, not as a rhetorical insertion, but as a substantive piece of valuable instruction.

(2) The Calendar of our Church contains a number of black-letter Saints'-days, which were clearly retained for the purpose of special commemoration. I am afraid that these Saints are almost entirely forgotten. I fear that many clergymen could give but a poor account of Lucian, Hilary, Prisca, Fabian, Agnes, and Vincent, to take only the black-letter days which occur in the month of January. It would surely be well if now and then one of these Saints was used as an example of Christian virtues, if their stories were sometimes simply told to simple folk. I need not pursue this subject in detail. It is enough to point out that our Church recognises the duty of teaching Church History to people. Ample material is afforded by the Calendar for bringing forward the leading features of the life of the early Church, and also of the special history of the Church in England. Alban, Augustine, Bede, Etheldreda, Chad, Dunstan, Elphege, Bishop Hugh—surely no Englishman should be ignorant of such lives as these; surely no clergyman should resign such memories.

(3) Suppose, however, a clergyman was of opinion that his pulpit was needed for its full measure of 104 times every year for more important subjects than these, still I would urge that there was room for them in children's services. I should like to know from my clerical brethren who have tried to give their addresses to children a wider range than they allowed themselves in their sermons, if the result was not a considerable congregation of adults beside the children. My own belief is that short addresses to children, in which the lives of holy men and women were told plainly, and were simply brought into relation with the life of their Master Christ, would prove attractive and helpful to very many besides those for whom they were intended. At all events, I suggest this as an experiment on the attractiveness of the subject which can be readily made.

(4) It is a question often asked, How are we to keep hold of our lads after Confirmation? Communicants' classes are begun and continue for a time, but gradually tend to fall off. This is a common experience; I do not say that it is by any means universal. But in all such attempts to deal with young folks who are entering upon a period of freedom from outward restraint, I think it is desirable to supply something in the shape of instruction as well as exhortation. Sermons tend to sameness, and the tendency to be always sermonising haunts all a clergyman's endeavours. I believe that those succeed best in gathering classes around them, and in retaining their attention, who pursue a course of varied yet systematic instruction. Suppose that a clergyman has succeeded, in his children's service, in creating a certain general interest in the lives of holy men in the past, he can carry on a course of addresses on some definite periods of the history of the Church, varied from time to time with doctrinal and devotional addresses. In fact the subject itself suggests them, and affords ample opportunity for their introduction. I believe that in many cases where this method has been tried it has been found eminently successful.

(5) In country districts, where amusements are few, there is generally an aspiring reading-room, which wishes to raise money by organising a course of lectures, and for this purpose the clergy are laid under contribution. I would suggest to any clergyman, who is not wedded to some special subject of his own, that he might combine a general desire to please his neighbours with the fulfilment of a portion of his own duty if he chose, under these trying circumstances, some incident or character from Church History. A lecture is only useful as possibly suggesting to some few of the audience a desire to read a book for themselves. It is a good thing never to give a lecture of any sort without mentioning a book in which the subject may be pursued further.

(6) Clergymen ought always to be well versed in the ecclesiastical history and antiquities of the district in which they labour. People are always interested in the place where they have been born and lived; and there are few ancient churches whose fabric does not furnish the text for many instructive sermons. Our parishes churches are as a rule our most ancient buildings; their architecture was influenced by local circumstances; their growth tells the story of local progress. Dedication Festivals are becoming more common, though they prevail generally in the case of churches of recent date. I would suggest that even in these cases some mention might be made of the ancient parish from which they sprang, and the congregation might be invited to consider the altered circumstances of society which called the new church into existence. Many villages have a yearly festival, which, so far as I can discover, is generally a remnant of the Dedication Festival of their church. These celebrations have now passed into mere meaningless merry-makings. It would be well if the clergy reclaimed them in some measure for their original purpose. In most cases where local festivities prevail, their source was some religious observance. The spirit of the old observance could generally be revived with profit, and special services might be held adapted to the case. The life of the English people is a continuous life. The Church should be the careful guardian of all that is inspiring and edifying in the memories of the past.

It may be urged that my argument is for turning the clergy into local antiquarians. Certainly, as far as his own church is concerned, every clergyman is in duty bound to know all about it that can be known. He is the guardian of its fabric, and he needs knowledge to discharge that duty wisely. The knowledge is not recondite, but can easily be acquired. Every neighbourhood contains one or two antiquaries who will be only too glad to place their information at his disposal. He need not be an antiquarian himself; but he should be the popular interpreter of the antiquarian lore of others. Our churches have suffered much in former times from the lamentable ignorance of those who were entrusted with their keeping. The mistakes of the past can only be avoided by more knowledge in the future. Apart from the usefulness of such knowledge to a clergyman in his practical work, he owes it as a public duty that he should spare no means to acquire it for his own guidance.

It will be said that my suggestions throw upon the clergy a great deal of additional work, and make demands upon the time of busy men which they can scarcely meet. However busy a man may be, he ought to have some time every day for reading which is not directly connected with his professional pursuits. The man does not act wisely, however zealous he may be, who is entirely absorbed in practical pursuits, however noble, and whose mind always plays round the details of his daily work. No outlying subject is more full of interest, is more closely allied to a clergyman's daily work, or is more likely to enlarge his mind and give him encouragement, than is the history of the Church of Christ.

Some continuous course of reading is needful, both as a relaxation and as a mental discipline. The dangers of half-knowledge, of over-haste, and want of sober judgment, beset a clergyman as much as anyone else. The nature of his work and calling does not in itself raise him above the general whirl of the world around him. Philanthropic schemes, societies, organisations, protests, and crusades tend to show the same characteristics as the political movements of the time. It is dangerous for all men alike not to be able to distinguish between claptrap and argument; it is still more dangerous to think that claptrap may be condoned if it is used for a pious purpose. Some course of study is needed as a mental discipline. If fewer schemes were started, and they were twice as wise, the world would be better off. The man who is too busy to find time to read anything not absolutely necessary, would discover that if he saved half-an-hour a day for study and reflection, with the purpose of self-discipline, his practical work would gain in efficiency, and his arrows, instead of being shot vaguely in the air, would hit some definite mark.

The study of Church History is one which would quickly produce fruits. A clergyman would soon be able to turn his knowledge to the advantage of his flock. Nor is the study difficult nor obscure; it can be began anywhere. The excellent series of *Diocesan Histories* now in course of publication are within every one's reach, and suggest constant subjects for more detailed reading. Clerical Societies might occasionally find room for historical papers and discussions. If the importance and usefulness of the study were more generally recognised, I do not think that the practical difficulties would be great.

Meanwhile an opportunity is being wasted; our splendid Cathedrals, our noble churches too often stand mere mute memorials. Let me tell you a significant incident narrated by one who is a keen observer of the signs of the times. He attended a large meeting of working-men, held under the shadow of one of our great Cathedrals; there were several platforms, and several speakers addressed at the same time portions of the vast gathering. At one platform, said my informant, the speaker in his peroration besought his hearers to act worthily of their mighty past, and pointed to the Cathedral as a testimony to the great deeds and noble aspirations of their forefathers. The allusion fell upon dull ears; no cheer was raised; the point fell flat. My friend strolled to the next platform, where he found an orator loud-voiced in his denunciation of the wrongs of bygone days. In passionate declamation he shook his fist at the Cathedral, the home of purse-proud prelates, who grew fat on the oppression of the poor. Again no cheer followed; again the rhetorical sally was unheeded. The working-men cared not for the good or evil of the past; their minds were set solely on the present, whose needs and requirements were sufficient in themselves. No thoughtful man will congratulate himself on this indifference. No serious mind will rejoice that such should be the temper of our time. If so it be, the Church can do more than any other institution to remedy it. What I have said has been said with a view of emphasising the greatness of the responsibility which falls upon her teachers.

The Dean of Gloucester expressed the thanks of the meeting to the writers of the thoughtful and instructive papers which had been read, and observed that many an active worker in the world would acknowledge how much in his course of action he owed to the patient thought of such men as Dr. Creighton and Dr. Harold Browne. He urged upon the clergy the importance of finding leisure for study, as a necessary part of the discipline of their daily lives.

The Rev. Canon Bernard deplored the vagueness with which Christian doctrine was too often preached at the present day, and insisted that there ought to be greater definiteness of teaching.

The Ven. Archdeacon Atkinson, the Rev. Audrey Moore, the Rev. R. W. Randall, and others also took part in the discussion.

At the afternoon meeting—

THE CHURCH IN INDIA, IN ITS RELATION TO EUROPEANS AND EURASIANS AND TO THE NATIVE RACES,

was the subject for discussion. Papers were read by Archdeacon Baly, the Rev. J. C. Whiteley, Sir Charles Turner, C.I.E., and the Rev. W. R. Blackett, and a discussion followed.

The President, in summing up the discussion, recommended that the Church of England should found a daughter Church in India, and announced that a layman in the diocese of Winchester had promised £1,000 for a special mission in the diocese of Rangoon.

The evening meeting was devoted to the subject of—

CHURCH DEFENCE.

The Rev. T. Moore, Vicar of Holy Trinity, Maidstone, read a paper on "The History of Church Property and Endowments," in which, contrasting the popular fallacies which occupy a prominent place in the Disestablishment and Disendowment theory, he asserted that the State, as a State, never built our Cathedrals and parish churches; never, in fact, formulated a national, diocesan, or parochial plan of church building and endowment; and never, from any public national funds or resources, made any provision for the maintenance of the Church or for the public worship of God in the land. On the contrary, the Church's property in her buildings, and her property in her endowments of lands, tithes, and funded investments, were of private origin, and are, or were, the gifts of her own individual members as such, representing all ranks of the community, from the King to the humblest property-holder in the land. The evidences presented by the churches and endowments themselves proved that they were not of State, but of private origin. The history of the origin and growth of tithes showed that tithes were originally a purely voluntary offering, which became due, as of right and possession, to the Church, and no charter or statute could be found setting forth an act of State endowment or State establishment of the Church. The only two statutes which contained any definite statements or even references to the founding of churches and the providing of endowments were the 25th Edward III., cap. 6, and 24th Henry VIII., cap. 12, section 1, and they both traced the property and endowments, not to public State origin, but to the liberality of the King's progenitors, and the ancestors of the nobles. The property of the Church was no more national than was the property national of every local corporation in the kingdom. The property of the Church was and could only be regarded as national property in the sense of being national for a specific, religious, and ecclesiastical use, to which it had from the date of its creation and dedication to this use been for long centuries exclusively applied. The national right of trust and of ownership in Church property was, therefore, limited to the State seeing to it that the property was properly and efficiently applied to its religious and ecclesiastical uses, and that its use, benefits, and advantages were secure to its subjects on the basis, conditions, and subject to the parochial and other limitations set forth or implied in the terms of its trust. The title of the Church to her property rested upon original, voluntary, lawful devotion—acts and deeds by virtue of which her individual members, representing all ranks and all estates in the kingdom, built her churches and provided for their endowments. It was a title which had the corroborative sanction of centuries of customary use and common law. It was a title which through hundreds of years had received the repeated confirmation of the legal decisions of the civil courts, and the legislative and executive confirmation of written or statute law. It was a title placed beyond all possibility of impeachment of many hundreds of years' continuously successive possession and use of the property held under it. It was a title which was not broken, nor even questioned, by William the Conqueror, Henry VIII., nor by any Sovereign or other head of the State at any time. And it was this title which the Liberation Society questioned, and which it proposed for the first time in history to disregard and break. It is the property held under it on which it proposes to the State to lay spoliating hands to such an extent as to rob the Church, Churchmen, and Englishmen of its possession and use for religious and ecclesiastical purposes, and to alienate and reapply it to secular objects altogether. If such a title were broken, and such property held under it be forcibly taken from the Church and from the uses of religion, then what title to property would remain indefeasible? If the Church's endowments were confiscated to the nation for the general public use, what was to prevent all other corporate, charitable, religious, and Nonconformist chapel property, or other property being confiscated to the State, and being, on the same principle, applied by it to general national uses?

Mr. Beresford Hope, M.P., treated of the social defence of the National Church:—

I have to treat a large subject in a few minutes, so I will assume without proof that the controversy between the supporters and the opponents of an Established Church has reached a stage in which pleading for mercy is to take a flagrantly insufficient attitude. Whatever may be the outcome, let the cry of justice rise on high. If our assailants prove to be a Chinese army, terrible with gongs and grotesque trappings, let us expose the imposture; but if the attack comes upon us, instinct with the obstinate vindictiveness engendered by class hatred, let us then beware of surrendering the advantage which assuredly comes to the side which refuses to leave the attack to the assailants' convenience. It is no longer enough for the defence of the Established Church to appeal to its ancient Constitutional prerogatives, for in the mouths of those with whom we have to reckon acknowledged privileges are travestied as an old injustice; nor will the case be much mended if we should be fortunate enough to show that the institution, of which the existence is menaced, dates back to days whose memory is dim; for the great philosophers, before whom we are bidden to bow down, show an irresistible propensity for returning to the artless ways of childhood, and are never so happy as when they are pulling up the roots to see how the plant has grown.

One line of argument remains—itself, it may be, not adequate to carry conviction to minds which do not wish to be convinced while they are waiting to be squeezed—but one which can at all events claim to submit the value of the Established Order to the test of practical results. This is the demonstration of active and increasing benefit on liberal and popular lines, as the terms are understood, bestowed on the commonwealth by the institution which is now standing on its trial, to be judged, as we hear, by its works. On these lines I take my stand; and I contend that, while for my own part cherishing the Church of England as that, spiritually, which I have learned to respect as an integral constituent element of what is not only a commonwealth, but also a realm—that is, a state in which the ideas of liberty and of order are equally and concurrently developed, yet, for the purpose of the present controversy, I am content to base my defence of it on reasons derived from the practical benefits of which the Church of England, as it now presents itself, is the gracious and unstinting dispenser to a willing people. I call on you to declare that these benefits are so special, and are increasing in so remarkable a ratio, that every year the plea for Disestablishment stands exposed as more flagrantly unjust and unreasonable.

My argument, as I shall proceed to unfold it, is mainly intended to confront the sophistries of liberationism by the irresistible logic of facts and figures; but it may have a further use so far as it tends to comfort some scrupulous Churchmen, to whom Establishment may be a stumblingblock, although I am glad to think that the number of those who find a discrepancy between the defence of the Church in its legitimate organisation, forms, and privileges, and the maintenance of a good understanding between Church and State, is rapidly lessening; for it is no longer possible not to see that repudiating Establishment as an allowable principle leads to the denial of the great truth, that the Lord God Omnipotent reigneth and calls for the homage of his creatures, while it ultimately lands us in the dilemma of having to accept a condition of persecution as the only natural one for the Christian Church to exist in. No doubt the earlier writings of the Tractarians, coloured as these were by the Erastianism, turned sour, which lay at the bottom of the Nonjurors' system, tended in the direction of such theories; but with those men at that time it was but a natural recoil from present and palpable shortcomings.

The successful career of the Colonial Churches, and of that of the United States, and the rally in Scotland of our Communion, are not to be assumed as any abatement of my position, unless it can be disproved that these, as branches from one stem, prove the vigour of the parent tree, so that, although separately unestablished, they yet as a whole are constituent elements of that great Church of which the Established Church in England is the central and most powerful organisation.

Passing, then, from theories to facts, what was the confessed condition of the Church up to, let us say, half-a-century back? We may cheerfully own that it was in those days the instrument of much—although unequally distributed, and too often imperfectly developed—good. But it was an institution which externally presented itself under the aspect of claiming deference rather than of earning consideration, and in respect of its internal organisation it was notably defective in all of the deliberative and administrative machinery needful for bringing the public opinion of clergy and laity to bear upon each other, upon themselves, and upon the whole Church, for the advancement of the common weal. Bishops, dignitaries, incumbents, layfolk—each and all of them were standing in a magic circle, within ear-shot and eye-shot of each other, and yet unable to join hands for any reciprocal help. The generally unenviable privilege of years carries with it abundant consolation when it enables the man, who has been striving to live all his days with open eyes and pliable hands, to grasp a revolution so overwhelming and yet so beneficent as the one which reckons for its term the short space of thirty-three years, since the day when, with infinite dexterity and perseverance, Bishop Wilberforce wrung from a bewildered and very timid Government what was generally esteemed the perilous concession of a two-day Session of the Convocation of Canterbury—a gift which would not in all probability have really been yielded but for the wordly-wise conviction that nothing could come of it. The untying of the tongue of Convocation was in various ways the beginning of difficulties, as the pains of sensation began to thrill through long-numbed limbs. I pass over the questions bearing upon the internal constitution of Convocation as a clerical assembly. The work of active life opened out its vista to the Church laity, though the gate was still barred, and the problem of their representation was canvassed with a zeal which we must own to have been somewhat crude. On the one side was the old Constitutional system of Convocation, and, on the other, the spectacle of the new clerical and lay assemblies of the American Church, and of those which were springing into being in the Colonial Church. At home were searchings of hearts, the most ardent reformers were only bent upon some tentative experiment, and the business on which they desired to engage the laity was administrative details, and not those declarations of the faith which were the most solemn functions of ancient Synods. But even this, to minds cast in the reverential mould of Dr. Pusey's, presented itself as perilous innovation. Yet a little fermentation, and the way of safety opened out with the meeting of the first Church Congress; and when the Church Congress itself left something manifestly to be desired, with its fixed debates, loose constitution, and no voting—first one diocese and then another called into being its formal assembly, assembled by election, and with definite rules for reaching a decision under the Bishop, and thus invested with an instinct of orderly authority which no Act of Parliament could really have bettered, though launched by the spontaneous energy of the Church, in the mixed conference of clergy and laity, by the side of yet not superseding the Congress. Then in natural sequence came the Central Council, and, last of all, that House of Laymen which is yet to assemble in concert with the Convocation. This, then, is the Church Administrative of 1885 existing on a broad popular basis, but under the conditions of establishment, and by the aid of such establishment, having worked out for itself—with no wrong or disadvantage to those outside of its own pale, though inside that of the State—a condition of co-operative administration, of freedom of speech, and of freedom of action, worlds in advance of anything which could have been dreamed of half-a-century back, the quintessence in fact of liberty and the living image of Liberalism. Why do I use those two words? I desire to believe that they are synonymous. But I cannot trace the connection in a Liberalism which employs its resources to select as the victim of a malicious and purposeless spoliation the one institution of the country which has known how to create for itself a representative life on the broadest basis, from its own inherent energy.

But so far I have only been speaking of the Church Administrative. There is something more hallowed even than administration—namely, prayer. What account have I to give of the Church Devotional during the last forty or fifty years? I have, I am glad to say, the materials ready at hand for my general answer, in a form of incontestable authority, no other than a Parliamentary return. In 1874 the late Lord Hampton obtained a return in the House of Lords, which came in by dioceses in 1874 and 1875, and was reprinted for the House of Commons—"showing the number of churches (including Cathedrals) in every diocese in England, which have been built or restored at a cost exceeding £500 since the year 1840; and showing also, as far as possible, the expenditure in each case, and the sources from which in each case the required funds were derived."

It will at once be seen that the return, though most instructive, is not a complete one for my present purpose. It takes no account of that vast accumulation of co-operative Church-work where each sum total may not have quite reached the limit of £500. Lincoln volunteers the supplementary information, and the sums between £100 and £500 amount to £36,413. Strange to say, too, parsonages are excluded, though we obtain a glimpse of what they might stand at in the volunteered information for the rural diocese of Oxford, and there they cost during the prescribed period the remarkable sum of £548,616. Endowments are another and necessarily very large omitted item, while Church schools and colleges, mission-rooms and institutions, find no place, and in a direct reference to churches the ceaseless stream of munificence—flowing day by day, and month by month—poured into the lap of the Church for all the incidents of worship, finds no record. Finally, the enumeration does not reach down to our own days, but only includes the period between 1840 and 1874, since which time I dare to assert that the offerings have gone on accumulating in an increasing ratio, not to point out that men now subscribe to new bishoprics. With all these abatements, however, the value of the figures speak for themselves, for they appear as the huge lump sum of £25,411,430, while the proportions which purely voluntary offerings bear to the funds available from formal sources may be tested by the fact that in the diocese of Exeter (then including Cornwall) out of a sum total of £782,305, private subscriptions stand at £709,253; while in Lichfield, which then comprehended the counties of Stafford, Derby, and half Shropshire, the voluntary contributions stand at £1,078,584, against a general total of £1,177,584. In London the ratio is even, though slightly, more satisfactory, as the general total is £2,770,826, of which private gifts represent £2,571,194. £1,305,357 spent upon new churches in the rural diocese of Oxford, containing no other even moderately large towns than Oxford and Reading, along with the more than half a million for parsonages, is a testimony to the great administration of Bishop Wilberforce—more eloquent than the most florid sentences of the rhetorician. I cannot, of course, pretend to guess how many millions may be represented by the omitted items all over England.

I must, in passing, observe that the four dioceses of Wales, which the glib Liberationist is never tired of presenting as wholly given over to Dissent, appear in this return as yielding an aggregate contribution of £1,284,468, under, as I must again point out, the single head of church building and restoration.

Let us now come to closer questions with our figures, for they are full of interesting suggestions. Let us take their dry bones and clothe them with flesh, and bid them live—an exceeding great army of momentous facts. What is the story which these aggregate millions, so suddenly let loose, tell? Is it not that of a young Church life, intense, varied, equably distributed, welling up like the great waters of a thirsty land, pervading the length and the breadth of the country, and compelling every district, stamped as it may be with the changeful distinctions of town and country, of north and south, to take upon itself the one sweet yoke of Christian discipline? These churches, built or restored, are no longer the mouldy temples of dulness, in which for the grudged fragment of a Sunday our grandparents had slumbered. They speak of a worship fervid, bright, and frequent, and the revived respect for holy seasons, such as this generation has learned to value. They speak on the part of those whose munificence has had so large a share in building up the good result, of a religious life, intense and patient, with many hopes and many fears, and a perception of the personal duty of the baptised Churchman to his Church, overflowing in language and in actions, which would a very short time since have been the unintelligible jargon of alien modes of thought, and, if noticed at all, would have been put on one side as narrow and repulsive Specialism. They speak, on the part of the clergy, of a life more and more passed in the silent presence of the Unseen; of hard continuous watching at the post of duty; of the never-ending toil of a ministry, where each soul is a loan of which the account is due. In fine, it would not be stilted language to say that the condition of the Church of England now, compared with what it was in 1840, points to the creation within us, and around us, of a new national power, and a general energy which cannot, without treason to truth, be denied or even depreciated. Those who measure it and love it not are accordingly paying it the compliment of trying to stamp it out.

I may be told that I am proving too much, and that a Church which can do so much, and in so short a time, from its own resources, does not now need the crutch of the State. This is simply the argument of the brigand who cannot find a record of ill-deeds to justify his spoliation, but is forced to seek it in an appeal to that jealousy which ever dogs the path of virtue. To disestablish under such conditions would be to reverse the parable, and punish the good servant by taking away the talents which his faithfulness had accumulated. Of course, a Church, such as ours now is, would be better prepared for disestablishment than it would have been half a century back. But still more emphatically would its disestablishment now be more cruel and indefensible, for the confiscation would be the penalty for conforming to, and not for straying from, those conditions which are, according to the straitest theory of technical Liberalism, the tests of the success and well working of institutions—such as expansiveness, elasticity, popular acceptance—evident practical results. The Church cannot, of course, be turned into a something which is the antithesis of its own definition; but, being the Church, it is becoming more popular in constitution, more interesting to the multitudes, and more available for its appointed work, far beyond the dreams of its best friends in a past generation; and the way in which Liberationism grapples with the phenomenon is to deafen the air by loud screaming—down with it, down with it, even to the ground. These clamourers are behaving after their kind. But the case is very different when one whose splendid eloquence had hitherto been uplifted to proclaim the blessings of the Established Spiritual Order by not discouraging the spoilers gives them effective aid. It is mocking our understandings to talk of "a large observance of the principles of equity and liberality" in connection with wholesale and purposeless rapine, and it is outraging our moral sense to prophesy soft things about "the vitality of the Church of England" over indefinite confusion and limitless ruin.

Dr. Jessopp established the continuous existence of the English Church from the date of the Council of Arles, A.D. 314, and the parochial system, established by Archbishop Theodore, had maintained its charter from that day to this. There was the same outcry against the Church of its wealth in the days of Bede which was raised now, not because it possessed large tracts of land, but because, by the ancient law, one-tenth of the freedom of the land had to be paid for the glory of God, the sustenance of His ministry, and the poor. But there was not a tittle of evidence that the poor were entitled to any definite portion of the tithe, though he might fairly say that the parish priest had generously interpreted his obligations with respect to the poor. There was no Church in Christendom which had such reason to be proud of its parochial system as the English Church.

Prebendary Harry Jones said the philanthropic work of the Church had been most efficient with respect to the dwellings of the poor, the relief of distress, and education, in which she had always led the van; but that work was even more effective in the daily wearying round of a parson's monotonous duties, inglorious and unrecorded as they were. The possession of such a clergy was one which the country would not readily forego.

After a few words from Mr. Dale Hart,

Prebendary Row wished to maintain the rights of the poor to the gratuitous ministrations of the clergy, of which they would be deprived if the Church were disendowed. Even if the funds of disendowment were applied for the purposes of free education about which there was such an outcry—a free education from which religious teaching would be taken away—it would only amount to a sop of a £1,500,000 in a total of about £8,000,000.

Other speakers followed.

(*Continued on page* 661.)

DOUBLE ACROSTIC.

NEW ACROSTIC RULES.

A Prize of One Guinea is given every month for the successful solution of the Acrostics that appear in the *John Bull*.

The present monthly competition will include the Acrostics that are given on October 3, 10, 17, 24, and 31.

At the end of the month, in case competitors tie, they will proceed to guess off the ties, being debarred from prize-winning in the fresh monthly competitions so long as they are engaged in contesting the ties.

No competitor can gain more than two Monthly Prizes in the course of the year.

All solutions must be forwarded not later than the Monday week following the appearance of the Acrostic, addressed to the Acrostic Editor of the *John Bull*, 6, Whitefriars-street, Fleet-street, E.C., and signed by a pseudonym of not inordinate length.

Alternatives to the number of three are allowed.

All solutions received are acknowledged, whether correct or not.

ANSWER TO DOUBLE ACROSTIC, No. 4.
(Seventh Month, Tenth Year.)

1. S woo P
2. P rate R
3. A lib I
4. I lia D
5. N il E

Solutions have been received from Camoens's, Iris, Peewit, Katydid, Allspice, Conjecture, Pansy, Two Countesses, Calverin, M.A.E.B., Etak, Hampton Courtier, Paddy, Persevere, Sociable, The Owl, Chelmsford, Ketha, Godiva, Pen, Hadji, Bios, Waddles, S.O.F., Toilet, Tim, Knutsford, Mrs. Mumms, Noryb, Veronmus, and Pegasus.

July Ties.—A Casual and Landlo' Nod have both sent correct solutions, and remain competing.

The August Prize has been won by
Miss G. E. Woodward (Roma),
South Lawn,
St. Leonards-on-Sea.

It is necessary to state that it is essential that the answer to a Light should be correctly spelt. This week, for instance, "Hilal" and "Prader" cannot be accepted.

MONTHLY LIST FOR SEPTEMBER.

1. Viz, L.E.L., Trouville, B.V., Wharp, Hum, Quandary, and Camoens.
2. The Owl, Pansy, Two Countesses, Conjecture, Nareme, Jones Crow, Pen, Magnet, Tilly Slowboy, Noryb, and Express.
3. Toilet, Knutsford, Tim, S.O.F., Waddles, Veronmus, Godiva, Chelmsford, Hampton Courtier, Sociable, Katydid, Pegasus, and Calverin.
4. Hadji, Mrs. Mumms, Ketha, Peewit, Etak, Allspice, Iris, Paddy, M.A.E.B., and Persevere.

Thus Allspice, Etak, Hadji, Iris, Ketha, M.A.E.B., Mrs. Mumms, Paddy, Peewit, and Persevere have tied for the September Prize, and remain competing.

DOUBLE ACROSTIC, No. 2.
(Eighth Month, Tenth Year.)

Proem.

My first and last, consecutively strung,
"Old Norway" signify in native tongue;
Whose heart welcome is, with kindness mated,
By travelling Englishmen appreciated.

1.
The G.O.M.'s elect'ners *forte*:
When seated, forms a family's support.

2.
His ghost, to punish her falsehood and perfidie,
To lower regions drags the perjured bride!

3.
Set thy sails warily, tempests will come:
Steer thy course steadily, Christian, steer home!

4.
A "Baron" famous, not for lands extensive,
But meaty extracts (N.B., not expensive).

5.
Bald-headed, at Niagara I stay,
Ready to pounce on roaring torrents' prey.

BRUSSELS SPROUT.

NEVER

SOLD in ENGLAND BEFORE at the PRICE.

The Pick of This Season's Growth.

BARBER & COMPANY'S
RICH SIRUPY
ONFA CONGO,

1s. 6d. per lb.

A Tea abounding in Strength and quality. 6lb. sent free, per parcels post, for 10s., 4½lb. for 7s. 6d., or 2½lb. for 4s. 3d., to any post town in the United Kingdom. Postal orders from 1s. 6d. to 10s. 6d. may now be had from all post offices for 1d. Compare this with that advertised at 2s., or 6lb. for 12s. 3d.

A LUXURY UNKNOWN IN ENGLAND.

BARBER & COMPANY'S
French Coffee as used in Paris.

In its Highest Perfection, 10d. per, lb. See that you have none other. 5lb. in tins sent free, per parcels post, for 5s. 6d. or 2lb. for 2s. 4d.

BARBER & COMPANY,
274, Regent Circus, Oxford Street, W.
61, Bishopsgate Street, E.C.

102, Westbourne Grove, W.
King's Cross, N.
42, Great Titchfield Street, W.
The Borough, London Bridge.
Brighton—147, North Street.
Birmingham Quadrant.
Liverpool—1, Church Street.
Manchester—93, Market Street.
Bristol—38, Corn Street.
Preston—Fishergate.

FERRIS' PERSIAN FOOD

(SALAP MISREE PERSIANA). REGISTERED.

"PERSIAN FOOD"

Is RECOMMENDED by the MOST EMINENT MEMBERS of the MEDICAL PROFESSION.

J. MACPHERSON, Esq., M.A., M.D. "35, Curzon Street, London, W., *January* 17, 1880.

"Dear Sir,—I have not employed any test of the purity of the 'PERSIAN FOOD' of which you have sent me a specimen, but I have made a trial of it, *and am much pleased with it, as supplying a light, bland, and pleasant form of nutriment.*—Yours faithfully, "J. MACPHERSON."

W. R. O'SHAUGHNESSY, Esq., M.D., F.R.S., &c. "Two drachms afford a sufficient meal for an invalid. Good 'PERSIAN FOOD,' carefully prepared, *is in truth* one of *the best articles of diet a convalescent can use.*

"THE MOTHER OF A LARGE FAMILY:" "It is only the barest justice to your 'PERSIAN FOOD' to say of it that it has been in my case an invaluable boon in the way of lessening my, unfortunately, ever-increasing maternal cares. While the Food has materially assisted in strengthening myself, it has, in the case of my last two infants, been freely and beneficially partaken of by them. To me and mine it has proved by far the best Food I have yet seen advertised. My name and address must not be attached to this note—that is, for publication; but I have no objection to the same being shown privately."

"GENTLEMEN—
I am bound to tender you my most hearty thanks for the very substantial benefits I have derived from the use of 'PERSIAN FOOD.' For some years my food would not properly assimilate and, as a last resource, I tried your 'PERSIAN FOOD.' Now my stomach is strong and the result is that I am in sound bodily health and good spirits.—Faithfully yours, Thomas Fordham.—February 9, 1880.—Messrs. Ferris and Co."

Sold in Bottles, 2s., 3s. 6d. and 10s. 6d. Directions on each Bottle.

To be had of all Chemists, Medicine Vendors, &c., or sent by Parcels Post on receipt of Remittance.

SOLE PROPRIETORS:—

FERRIS & CO.,
49, Fleet Street, London, E.C.

THE COMMISSIONERS OF INLAND REVENUE hereby give notice that under the CUSTOMS AND INLAND REVENUE ACT (48 and 49 Vic. cap. 51) of last Session, all BODIES, CORPORATE and UNINCORPORATE, are required to PAY a DUTY at the rate of 5 per cent. upon the ANNUAL VALUE, income, or profits accruing to them from their REAL and PERSONAL PROPERTY.

With a view to the assessment of the duty, all such bodies are bound, under heavy penalties, to render returns, supported by full accounts, before the 1st December next.

Applications for forms of Return, and all inquiries, should be addressed to

THE SECRETARY,
Corporation Branch,
Inland Revenue,
Somerset House,
W.C.

CHAPMAN & HALL'S
NEW BOOKS.

In 2 vols., demy 8vo,

LIFE of MONSEIGNEUR DUPANLOUP. By the Abbé F. LAGRANGE. Translated from the French by Lady HERBERT. [Next week.

A NEW COOKERY BOOK.

THE PYTCHLEY BOOK of REFINED COOKERY and BILLS of FARE. By Major L——. Large crown 8vo, 8s. [This day.

With illustrations, crown 8vo, 8s.

AUSTRALIAN LIFE: Black and White. By Mrs. CAMPBELL PRAED.

Now ready, the Eleventh Thousand of

THE RADICAL PROGRAMME.
With a Preface by the Right Hon. J. CHAMBERLAIN, M.P., crown 8vo, 2s. 6d.

"The book is in every sense interesting, and its appearance now is timely. . . . Hardly any point, so far as we can see, of what ought to be and must be the Radical programme is left unpresented to the consideration of the reader."—Daily News.

Second Edition, demy 8vo, 12s,

MODERN SCIENCE and MODERN THOUGHT. By S. LAING, M.P.

"It is the expression of a sensible, well-read, compromise-loving Briton's final conclusions upon religious matters. The first part is a rapid and clearly-written résumé of all that modern science and modern criticism have done to sap the foundation of current theologies and the current dogmas. This résumé is admirably done. . . marshalled with considerable skill, and enforced by excellent and typical examples. . . . Pleasantly written pages."—Pall Mall Gazette.

EVAN HARRINGTON. By GEORGE MEREDITH. Large crown 8vo, 6s. Forming a new volume of a Uniform Edition of the works of George Meredith.

"Evan Harrington, one of the best of Mr. Meredith's novels, is now before us in handy, solid, single-volume shape; price six shillings. . . . Genius of a truly original and spontaneous kind shines in every one of his books; with healthy benevolent sympathy they abound; and if there exists any greater master of his native tongue than Mr. Meredith, we have yet to hear of the gentleman's name."—St. James's Gazette.

NEW NOVEL BY JEAN MIDDLEMASS.

A GIRL in a THOUSAND. By JEAN MIDDLEMASS. 2 vols., crown 8vo. [This day.

A NOVEL BY WILLIAM RAABE.

THE HUNGER-PASTOR. By WILLIAM RAABE. Translated from the German by "Arnold." 2 vols., crown 8vo. [Next week.

CHAPMAN and HALL (Limited), Henrietta-street, W.C.

THE QUARTERLY REVIEW, No. 322, will be published on THURSDAY, OCTOBER 15th.

CONTENTS:

I. THE REVISED VERSION OF THE OLD TESTAMENT.
II. PREDECESSORS OF SHAKESPEARE.
III. TAXES AND TAXATION.
IV. TAINE ON JACOBINISM.
V. HORSE RACING.
VI. ENGLAND AND EGYPT IN THE SOUDAN.
VII. FORGERIES OF THE ABBÉ FOURMONT.
VIII. OUR DUTY TO SOUTH AFRICA.
IX. THE COMING ELECTIONS.

JOHN MURRAY, Albemarle Street.

SERMONS in Manuscript, Lithographed, and in Printed Volumes. Catalogues of Sermons and other Theological Books gratis and post free.

CHARLES HIGHAM,
Theological Bookseller,
27A, Farringdon-street, London, E.C.
Libraries and small parcels of books bought for cash.

THE CHURCH DEFENCE INSTITUTION.

Applications for LECTURERS and PUBLICATIONS should be addressed, in separate covers, to

THE SECRETARY,
Church Defence Institution, 9, Bridge-street, Westminster, S.W.

POROUS DISINFECTOR,

Placed in the W.C. Cistern, impregnates, with Liq. Pot. Permang. (Condy's Fluid) every drop of water passing through the closet and entire drainage system of the house, thus preventing all bad effluvia.

5/- NO FIXING WHATEVER.

SHARP & CO.,
11, Holborn Circus, London, E.C.

BEMROSE and SONS' LIST.

WILL BE READY DECEMBER 1st,

THE OFFICIAL REPORT OF THE CHURCH CONGRESS
HELD AT PORTSMOUTH,
On October 6th, 7th, 8th, and 9th, 1885.

Containing the Sermons and the Papers in full, and Reports of all the Speeches. An efficient Staff of Parliamentary Reporters has been engaged, and the Speeches will be revised by the Speakers.

The report will be supplied at Subscription Price by the Publishers only, to whom all names and addresses should be sent direct.

Price to Subscribers, 6s. 6d. in paper, 7s. post-free; 7s. 6d. in cloth, 8s. post-free; and half-calf antique, 10s., post-free 10s. 6d. After publication the price will be 10s. 6d. in cloth.

THE OFFICIAL REPORT OF THE CHURCH CONGRESS.
Demy 8vo, cloth, price 10s. 6d. each.
1882. Derby.
1883. Reading.
1884. Carlisle.

Parish and Household Sheet Almanack for 1886. This Almanack, 30 by 20in., is printed in Red and Black, with Daily Texts, Poetry, Addresses, and Miscellaneous Matter, and has a large and well-executed Illustration, especially designed and engraved. It is attractive for the Cottage Walls, and is especially adapted for Localisation. Specimens, with Suggestions for Localising, Terms, &c., will be sent, post-free, on application.

Mission Hymnals. Seven different Selections. List, with Specimens and Terms, upon application.

The Clergyman's Ready Reference REGISTER. Forming a complete Record of Private and Parochial Information; containing Fourteen Registers arranged for Services, Occasional Offices, Confirmations, Churchwardens' Accounts, Summaries, Parish Meetings, and Clubs; with Private and Miscellaneous Matter on an Original Plan. By Rev. THEODORE JOHNSON.

A. Edition for 10 years, 230pp., in boards, price 10s. 6d.; or in extra strong binding, with lock and key fitted, price 14s. 6d.

B. Edition for 5 years, 121pp., containing the 14 Registers, in boards, price 6s. 6d., or in extra strong binding, with lock and key fitted, price 10s. 6d.

Combined Register of Preachers, Offertory, and COMMUNICANTS. Rule 1 and printed on good paper, bound in cloth. Registered for 250 names, 3s. 6d.; 500 names, 4s. 6d.; 1,000 names, 6s.

Register of Candidates presented for Confirmation. Ruled and printed on good paper, bound in cloth. Register for 500 names, 3s. 6d.; 1,000 names, 4s. 6d.; 2,000, 6s.

Bemrose's Preacher's Book. Printed and ruled, for Register of Services, Sermons, Collections, &c. Foap. folio. With sixty leaves, price 5s. 6d.; with 100 leaves, 8s.; with 150 leaves, 10s.

Church Door Calendars. Space for each day in the week for notices of Services, Lectures, &c. Specimens on application. Size 16in. by 10in. The Set of Fifty-two, 2s. 6d.; headed with Name of Parish, 3s. 6d.

For Oxford frame for ditto (without glass) 2s. 6d.

Service Tables (Choir Notices). Printed in red and black, to be filled in with the Chants, Hymns, Tunes, &c., for Reading-desk, Choir, Organ, &c. Specimens on application. Eight varieties, 1s. 6d. per 100.

Baptismal and Sponsors' Cards. Printed in two colours. 8s. per 100; 1s. 3d. per dozen; 1½d. each.

Confirmation Cards. Illuminated for Framing. First Quality, 32s. per 100; 5s. der doz.; 6d. each. Second Quality, 14s. per 100; 1s. 8d. per doz.; 2d. each. Size, 9in. by 6in. Plain ones printed at cheap rates.

Banns Book. 200 leaves, bound in calf, 12s. 6d.; 100 leaves, calf, 8s. 6d.; 100 leaves, forrel, 7s. 6d.; fifty leaves, calf, 6s; fifty leaves, forrel, 5s.

Ecclesiastical and Academical Colours. By the Rev. T. H. WOOD. Foap. 8vo, cloth, 1s. 6d.

Bemrose's Sunday-school Registers. (List on application.)

Offertory Forms, for recording the Offertories made each Sunday, for posting on Church doors, &c. 1s. 6d. per 100, post-free 1s. 8d.; Oxford frames for do. (without glass) 1s. 6d. See Illustrated Sheet of Specimens.

Offertory Books, containing Three Offertory Forms on every leaf, two of which can be detached for posting on Church doors, and one remain fixed in the book. Bound in cloth, 100 leaves, 3s.; 200 leaves, 4s. 6d.; 300 leaves, 6s. each.

The New Code (1885-86) of Minutes of the EDUCATION DEPARTMENT, with the Revised Instructions to Inspectors (1885) and Official Forms and Documents, with Explanatory Notes, and a Copious Index. By THOMAS EDMUND HELLER, Secretary National Union of Elementary Teachers. Eleventh Edition. (Revised and greatly Enlarged.) Demy 8vo, price 1s.

London: BEMROSE and SONS, 23, Old Bailey; and Derby.

POPULAR NEW NOVELS
AT ALL THE LIBRARIES.

A GIRTON GIRL.
By MRS. ANNIE EDWARDES.
3 vols.

ANDROMEDA.
By GEORGE FLEMING.
2 vols.

FOR LILIAS.
By R. N. CAREY.
3 vols.

SISTERS-IN-LAW.
By Lady MARGARET MAJENDIE.
3 vols.

MRS. HOLLYER.
By GEORGIANA M. CRAIK.
3 vols.

RICHARD BENTLEY and SON, New Burlington street.

THE

BRÉANSKI ALBUM

(REGISTERED).

Containing 12 pages of Fac-simile Water-Colour Drawings of Picturesque Scenery

IN ENGLAND, IRELAND, SCOTLAND, and WALES.

"The BREANSKI ALBUM.—This splendid Album, published by T. J. Smith, Son, and Downes, contains twelve pages of fac-simile water-colour drawings of picturesque scenery in ENGLAND, IRELAND, SCOTLAND, and WALES, from original sketches by Mr. Alfred de Bréanski. To face these water-colours, which are produced in the highest style of lithographic art, are a number of designs, printed in gold, of the rose, shamrock, and thistle, poppy, &c., representing these natural flowers, which form charming borders for the photographs. Mr. Bréanski wields a facile brush, and has given us in this album a charming series of views which will recall to those who possess them many trips in pleasant places. The reproduction also merits high praise, for it is seldom this kind of work is so well done, and photographs will gain an added grace in these beautiful pages, an important fact often forgotten by the designers of such albums."—*Court Circular*, Nov. 29, 1884.

T. J. SMITH, SON & DOWNES,
109, Queen Victoria-Street, London, E.C.

THE COMING ELECTION.

The attention of all interested in this important National Election is invited to the following:—

PHILIPS' ATLAS of the COUNTIES of ENGLAND, containing 48 Plates, with complete Index. Special Edition, showing the New Parliamentary Divisions, 1885. Crown folio, half-bound morocco, gilt edges, price £2 2s.

PHILIPS' HANDY ATLAS of the COUNTIES of ENGLAND, New and Special Edition, showing the New Parliamentary Divisions, 1885. Containing 43 Maps and Index. Price 3s. 6d. in cloth; 6s. leather back.

PHILIPS' REDISTRIBUTION MAP of LONDON, showing all the New Boroughs, with the number of their Representatives, Statistics of Population, &c. Scale 2 inches to a mile. Price in case, 3s. 6d.; mounted on cloth and in case, 6s.

GEORGE PHILIP and SON, 32, Fleet-street, London.

Just ready, demy 12mo, price 7s. 6d.; for cash, post free, 6s. 4d.

THE CANDIDATE'S AND ELECTION AGENT'S GUIDE,
For Parliamentary and Municipal Elections; with an Appendix of forms and Statutes.
By JOHN LOADER, Esq., Barrister-at-law, Election Agent
STEVENS and SONS, 119, Chancery-lane, London.

CLARENDON PRESS NEW LIST.

Just ready. In 2 vols. demy 8vo, with Plates and Maps, £1 16s.

ITALY and HER INVADERS, 476-553.
By THOMAS HODGKIN, Fellow of University College, London, Hon. D.C.L. of Durham University. Vol. III. Book IV.—THE OSTROGOTHIC INVASION. Vol. IV. Book V.—THE IMPERIAL RESTORATION.
"Everywhere his pages show thorough workmanship. He tells his tale admirably and is never dull. His book is a contribution to general literature no less than to historical science. Its pages are full of happy analogies and illustrations drawn from all periods of history. It has all the attractiveness of a book written with genuine enthusiasm, while no labour has been spared to make it as complete as possible."—Contemporary Review (Prof. Creighton).

Just published. Demy 8vo, cloth, 10s. 6d.

STUDIA BIBLICA; Essays in Biblical Archæology and Criticism and Kindred Subjects. By Members of the University of Oxford (including Professors DRIVER, WORDSWORTH, and SANDAY).

Just ready. Crown 8vo, cloth, 4s 6d.

LECTURES on ECCLESIASTES DELIVERED IN WESTMINSTER ABBEY. By the Very Rev. GEORGE GRANVILLE BRADLEY, D.D., Dean of Westminster.
"Dean Bradley's charming book"—Academy.

Immediately. Demy 8vo, cloth, 18s.

THE LANGUAGES of MELANESIA. By R. H. CODRINGTON, D.D., of the Melanesian Mission, Fellow of Wadham College, Oxford.

Immediately. Fcap. 8vo, cloth, 2s.

SAINTE-BEUVE.—CAUSERIES DU LUNDI. Selections. Edited and arranged by G. SAINTSBURY, M.A., Author of "A Short History of French Literature."

Immediately. Fcap. 8vo, cloth, 3s.

TERENCE.—ANDRIA. Edited with Introduction and Notes, by C. E. FREEMAN, M.A., and A. SLOMAN, M.A., Masters in Westminster School, Editors of "Plautus Trinummus."

Immediately. Fcap. 8vo, cloth, 3s. 6d.

HINTS and HELPS for LATIN ELEGIACS. By H. LEE WARNER, M.A., Master in Rugby School, formerly Fellow of St. John's College, Cambridge, Editor of "Extracts from Livy."

SUBJECTS FOR THE OXFORD LOCAL EXAMINATIONS, 1885.

Just published. Extra fcp. 8vo, stiff covers, 2s. 6d.

JOHNSON'S LIVES of DRYDEN AND POPE. With Introduction and Notes, by A. MILNES, M.A.Lond., Editor of Butler's "Hudibras," &c.

Just published. Extra fcap. 8vo, cloth, 2s.

EDGAR QUINET.—LETTRES A SA MERE. Selected and Edited by GEORGE SAINTSBURY, Author of "A Primer of French Literature," &c.

Third and New Edition. Carefully Revised and Enlarged. With New Map of the Siege of Antwerp. Extra fcap. 8vo, cloth, 2s. 6d.

SCHILLER'S HISTORISCHE SKIZZEN; EGMONT'S LEBEN und TOD: and BELAGERUNG von ANTWERPEN. Edited, with Notes, Introductions, &c., by C. A BUCHHEIM, Ph.D., Professor of German in King's College, London.
"Dr. Buchheim, as the Editor of this Series, requires no praise. He has long ago secured it, and deserved what he has secured."—Notes and Queries.

SUBJECT FOR LONDON MATRICULATION.

Just ready. Fcap. 8vo, cloth, 3s. 6d.

OVID'S TRISTIA.—BOOK I. The Text Revised, with Introduction and Notes for Schools, by S. G. OWEN, B.A., Assistant Lecturer in Greek and Latin at the Owens College, Victoria University, Manchester, and formerly Open Exhibitioner of Balliol College, Oxford.

Just ready. Fcap. 8vo, ornamental vellum, 7s. 6d.; cloth, 5s

STEELE.—Selections from the "Tatler," "Spectator," and "Guardian." Edited, with Introduction and Notes, by AUSTIN DOBSON.

London: HENRY FROWDE, Clarendon Press Warehouse, Amen Corner, E.C.

WM. CLOWES & SONS, Limited,

LAW PUBLISHERS AND BOOKSELLERS,

27, FLEET STREET, LONDON, E.C.

(Six doors East of Inner Temple Lane).

THE GENERAL ELECTION.

Now ready, demy 8vo, cloth, price 30s.

THE

PARLIAMENTARY ELECTION ACTS

FOR

ENGLAND AND WALES.

Arranged according to the Qualification and the Registration of Electors, Electoral Areas, the Disqualification of Candidates, the Election, and the Election Petition. With Notes, History, and Summary. Being a Treatise on the Law of the Election of Members in England and Wales to the House of Commons of the United Kingdom.

By J. M. LELY, Editor of "Chitty's Statutes," &c.; and W. D. I. FOULKES, Joint Editors of "The Judicature Acts," and Barristers-at-Law.

Just published, demy 8vo, cloth, price 17s. 6d.

ELECTION LAW,

AND THE

LAW AND PRACTICE OF ELECTION PETITIONS.

By VAREDOROUGH ANDERSON, M.A., LL.B., and CHARLES EDWARD ELLIS, B.A., Barristers-at-Law.

Being the Fourth Edition of Leigh and Le Marchant's "Election Law."

London: WILLIAM CLOWES & SONS, Limited, 27, Fleet Street, E.C.

JUST PUBLISHED.

II. CORINTHIANS AND GALATIANS.

By Ven. Archdeacon F. W. FARRAR, D.D., and Rev. Preb. E. HUXTABLE, M.A.,

with HOMILIES by Rev. Ex-Chancellor Lipscomb, LL.D., Rev. David Thomas, D.D., Rev. Donald Fraser, D.D., Rev. R. Tuck, B.A., Rev. E. Hurndall, M.A., Rev. Prof. J. R. Thomson, M.A., Rev. R. Finlayson, B.A., Rev. W. F. Adeney, M.A., Rev R. M. Edgar, M.A., and Rev. T. Croskerry, D.D.

Super royal 8vo, cloth, 21s.

[THE PULPIT COMMENTARY.

London: KEGAN PAUL, TRENCH, and CO.

GRANTS are made in special cases on the introduction of the HYMNAL COMPANION into poor parishes.

A SPECIMEN COPY of the Shilling Edition of **THE HYMNAL COMPANION TO THE BOOK OF COMMON PRAYER,** Edited by the RIGHT REV. E. H. BICKERSTETH, D.D., Lord Bishop of Exeter, and a Prospectus of the various Editions, will be sent Gratis and Post Free to any Clergyman who will apply for it, and send Address on Post Card to the Publishers.

This Hymnal is now used in more than 3,000 Churches. It is published in 16 Editions, from One Penny to 8s. 6d. The Musical Editions contain 367 Tunes and 600 Chants.

Works by the Right Rev. E. H. BICKERSTETH, D.D.,
LORD BISHOP OF EXETER.

FROM YEAR to YEAR: Poems and Hymns for all the Sundays and Holy Days of the Church. 16mo. with red border lines, cloth, red edges, 3s. 6d.; parchment, 3s. 6d.; roan, gilt edges, 5s.; padded roan, 6s.; calf or morocco, gilt edges, 10s. 6d.

THE MASTER'S HOME-CALL; or, Brief Memorials of Alice Frances Bickersteth. Twenty-third Thousand, 1s.

THE MASTER'S WILL. A Funeral Sermon. Sewn, 6d.; cloth gilt, 1s

THE SHADOWED HOME and the LIGHT BEYOND. Sixth Edition, 5s.

THE SHADOW of the ROCK. A Selection of Religious Poetry. 16mo, cloth extra, 2s. 6d.

EVANGELICAL CHURCHMANSHIP and EVANGELICAL ECLECTICISM. 1s.

THE CLERGYMAN in his HOME. 1s.

THE REEF, and other PARABLES. New Edition, illustrated, 2s. 6d.

London: SAMPSON LOW, MARSTON, SEARLE, and RIVINGTON,
CROWN BUILDINGS, 188, FLEET STREET, E.C.

BURNS AND OATES' LIST.

Just out.

Dictionary of English Catholic Biography and BIBLIOGRAPHY. From the Breach with Rome, in 1534, to the present time. By JOSEPH GILLOW. Vol. I. Demy 8vo, cloth, 15s. Vol. II. ready shortly. To be published in Five Vols. Price per Vol., 15s.
"No such important or novel contribution has been made to English bibliography for a long time."—Scotsman.
"We recommend it most unreservedly."—British Mail.
"The Bibliographical section of the work merits a special notice and commendation."—Month.
"A work of the highest usefulness."—Tablet.

NEW BOOKS.

The Truth about John Wyclif: his Life, Writings, and Opinions, chiefly from the evidence of his Contemporaries. By JOSEPH STEVENSON, S.J. Crown 8vo, cloth, 7s. 6d

The War of Anti-Christ with the Church and CHRISTIAN CIVILISATION. A Review of the Rise and Progress of Atheism; its use of Freemasonry and Kindred Secret Societies &c., &c.; and "The Spoliation of the Propaganda." By the Right Rev. Mgr. GEORGE DILLON, D.D. Imperial 8vo, 5s.

Mary Queen of Scots, Life of. By Agnes STEWART. Crown 8vo, 500pp., 3 Illustrations, best paper, 10s. 6d.; six Illustrations, elegantly bound, 12s. 6d.

Life and Martyrdom of St. Thomas BECKET. By the Rev. JOHN MORRIS, S.J. Second and Enlarged Edition. One Vol., large post 8vo, 12s. 6d. Or bound in Two Parts. 13s.

Life of St. Charles Borromeo. From the Italian of JOHN PETER GUISSANO. With Preface by Cardinal MANNING. Two Vols, 15s.

Suarez on the Religious State. A Digest on the Doctrine contained in his Treatise, "De Statu Religionis." By Rev. W. HUMPHREY, S.J. Three Vols. Royal 8vo, £1 10s.

Public Life of Our Lord. By the Rev. H. J. COLERIDGE, S.J. Eight Volumes are now published, 6s. 6d. each:—
Vol. I. The MINISTRY of ST. JOHN BAPTIST.
Vols II., III., and IV. SERMON on the MOUNT. (Three Parts.)
Vols. V., VI., VII., and VIII. TRAINING of the APOSTLES. (Four Parts.)

Eternal Priesthood. By Cardinal Man- NING. Popular Edition. 2s. 6d.

St. Francis de Sales (The Works of).
Translated into the English Language by the Rev. H. B. MACKEY, O.S.B., under the Direction and Patronage of the Right Rev. Dr. HEDLEY, O.S.B.
Vol. I. LETTERS to PERSONS in the WORLD. 6s.
Vol. II. The LOVE of GOD. Founded on the rare and practically unknown English Translation by MILES CAR, Priest of the English College of Douay, 1630. 9s.
Vol. III. The CATHOLIC CONTROVERSY. [In the press.

In the press.
Price to Subscribers, 15s.; Non-Subscribers, £1 1s.

The English Catholic Nonjurors of 1715. Being a Summary of the Register of their Estates, with Genealogical and other Notes, and an Appendix of Unpublished Documents in the Public Record-office. Edited by JOHN ORLEBAR PAYNE, M.A. One Vol., demy 8vo. (Prospectuses on application.)

John Tauler's "Following of Christ" (a Translation of). In One Vol., price 2s. 6d.

The Catholic Life and Letters of Cardinal Newman, which recently appeared in one of the Magazines, will shortly be issued, handsomely bound in cloth. Crown 8vo. Price 2s. 6d.

London: Granville Mansions, 28, Orchard-street, W., and 63, Paternoster-row, E.C.; and at New York.

WARD & DOWNEY'S NEW BOOKS.

In 2 vols., large crown 8vo, with an Original Etching of Charles II., and Eleven other Portraits, 25s.

ROYALTY RESTORED: or, London under Charles II. By J. FITZGERALD MOLLOY, Author of "Court Life below Stairs; or, London Under the Georges," &c.
"Interesting as the period with must of necessity be, Mr. Molloy's volumes gain additional value from the obvious labour which he has bestowed upon the important point of securing absolute historical accuracy; and this, together with the illustrations of Court beauties and a rare etched portrait of Charles II., lend the volume a sterling value."—Society.

In 2 vols., demy 8vo, with an Etched Portrait of Richard III., and other Portraits and Illustrations, 30s.

THE UNPOPULAR KING: the Life and Times of Richard III. By ALFRED O'LEGGE, F.C.H.S.

New Novels at Every Library.

WHERE TEMPESTS BLOW. By the AUTHOR of "MISS ELVESTER'S GIRLS." 3 vols. [Just ready.

LESS THAN KIN. By J. E. PANTON, Author of "Jane Caldecott," &c. 1 vol. [This day.

A PRINCE of DARKNESS. By FLORENCE WARDEN, Author of "The House on the Marsh," &c. 3 vols.
"A spirited melodrama written with unflagging buoyancy, and overflowing with exciting occurrences."—St. James's Gazette.

IN SIGHT of LAND. By Lady DUFFUS HARDY. 3 vols.
"Always natural, and at times extremely pathetic."—Athenæum.

AS in a LOOKING-GLASS. By F. C. PHILIPS. 2 vols.
"A really remarkable story. . . . It is at once a powerful tragedy, a portfolio of character sketches, and a diorama of Society scenes."—Globe.

12, YORK STREET, COVENT GARDEN, LONDON.

THE MOST BENEFICENT INVENTION
THE WORLD HAS EVER KNOWN.
Vide upwards of 1,850 Press Opinions.

ONE of the MOST REMARKABLE INVENTIONS of the AGE.
Vide "Knowledge," March 6th, 1885.

DR. CARTER MOFFAT'S AMMONIAPHONE,
FOR VOICE CULTIVATION
And the Cure of
ASTHMA, BRONCHITIS,
PULMONARY HÆMORRHAGE,
INCIPIENT CONSUMPTION,
And all Affections of the
THROAT and CHEST.

DR. CARTER MOFFAT
Has the following in the latest edition of the "History of the Ammoniaphone":—
"I desire to draw the attention of the medical world to a recent discovery of my own in reference to the application of chemical science to the instant removal of hæmoptysis, or bleeding from the lungs.
"There are many persons who have the hæmorrhagic diathesis and tendency to lung-bleeding, and also there are those whose lungs are in a weakly and disorganised condition, who from phthisis, or it may be other complaints, are in constant danger of hæmoptysis.
"By the injection or inhalation into the lungs of volatile antiseptics of the cressylic, terebinthic, carbolic, pyridic, toludic, piperic, and many other undetermined series, it is possible to instantly stop the bleeding.
"The ordinary ammoniaphone, saturated as it is with peroxide of hydrogen, amide of hydrogen, and ammonia, is further drenched with the highly volatile antiseptics named, and when a rapid current of air is drawn into the lungs through the instrument, the air becomes supersaturated with the antiseptics, which impinge on the injured vein or artery in the lung, with the result that in a few moments the bleeding ceases, and, by continuing the inhalations several times daily, the broken lung vessel becomes cemented up with coagulated hæmatosine. All educated medical scientists are aware that the albuminous and fibrinous matters in blood are coagulated by antiseptics of the series last mentioned, as well as by many others. Here, then, we have a means at hand, always ready for use, of doing good in a moment; and I have now seen a number of cases, so that, alike in theory and in practice, the inhalation of volatile antiseptics, employed in the manner stated, is correct."

DR. A. S. KENNEDY, L.R.C.P., L.R.C.S., &c., writes as follows—
"The two Ammoniaphones that I had from you have given very good results. Apart from improved timbre, resonance, and extension of register, which are undeniable, I have found the Ammoniaphone most useful in cutting short catarrhal and laryngeal troubles and of great benefit in removing huskiness. Several patients have tried the Ammoniaphone at my suggestion, and are all pleased with the improvement in their voices."

DR. CARTER MOFFAT'S AMMONIAPHONE
is invaluable to
ACTORS, VOCALISTS, PUBLIC SPEAKERS,
CHURCH and CHAPEL CHOIRS, and
BARRISTERS. And highly gratifying testimonials have been received from
MADAME ADELINA PATTI,
MADAME MARIE ROZE, DEAN VAUGHAN,
LADY (wife of Sir G. A.) MACFARREN,
REV. H. R. HAWEIS, M.A.,
CHARLES WYNDHAM, Esq.,
MADAME ROSE HERSEE,
REV. W. HAY M. H. AITKEN, MISS LEONORA BRAHAM,
MISS CARLINGFORD, Mons. MARIUS,
MADAME LOUISE LIEBHART,
HON. MRS. CHOLMONDLEY,
And many others of equal standing, too numerous to quote. Write for copies of testimonials, post free.

DR. CARTER MOFFAT attends DAILY at the ROOMS of the MEDICAL BATTERY COMPANY (Limited), 52, Oxford-street, London, W., to demonstrate the extraordinary utility of the "Ammoniaphone." Write for the "History of the "Ammoniaphone," 80pp., 4to, post free.

DR. CARTER MOFFAT'S AMMONIAPHONE (Harness' Patent) will be sent free by post to any part of the United Kingdom on receipt of P.O.O. or cheque (crossed "London and County Bank" for 21s., and payable to C. B. Harness, the
MEDICAL BATTERY COMPANY, (Limited),
No. 52, OXFORD-STREET, LOMDON, W.

JOHN BULL.

LONDON, OCTOBER 10.

HISTORY OF THE WEEK.

The professed anxiety of Radical politicians for an authoritative statement of Conservative policy has been, it is to be hoped, fully satisfied by the speech of Lord SALISBURY at Newport. The PRIME MINISTER traverses the burning questions of the day, and pronounces upon them deliberate judgments which the country is called upon to approve or reject. The English people have submitted to them clear and frank opinions, and are invited to support a definite line of conduct; there is neither vagueness nor uncertainty in the statements of what Lord SALISBURY will do and of what he will leave undone, of what he approves

and of what he is opposed to. The contrast between the Newport declarations and the Hawarden manifesto is sharp and complete. Lord Salisbury's policy is clear and precise; Mr. Gladstone's views are left hazy and indistinct. In the one case we have the convictions of the statesman, in the other case the cant of the politician. Lord Salisbury declares, in the first place, emphatically, that the unity of the kingdom and the integrity of the Empire are the first objects that the Tory party will hold in view. He declares against any concession to Mr. Parnell's demand for Irish independence, and equally declares against the concession of powers of local self-government to the Irish people, which would simply pave the way to the achievement of the aims of the Nationalists. On the Land question, Lord Salisbury is ready to do all that can be done to simplify and cheapen land transfer, but he is opposed to any system of creating artificial peasant proprietorships at the expense of the ratepayers. He is prepared for a system of local government which will abolish the existing abuses of centralisation, and he is in favour of a reform of the system of local taxation. To the proposals for free education, and to their necessary corollary the destruction of religious education, he is resolutely opposed. And on the great question which, if the next General Election results in the return of a Liberal majority, is certain to engage the attention of Parliament, the Disestablishment and Disendowment of the Church, he speaks with no uncertain sound. So long as the Tory party exists, and Lord Salisbury is its leader, it will offer a passionate, an uncompromising, and a relentless resistance to the attacks of the Liberation Society which Mr. Chamberlain leads, which Mr. Gladstone favourably regards, and which Lord Hartington and Mr. Goschen will not be found opposing. Lord Salisbury's programme is one that the Tory party in the country will regard with general approval, and to which on the great issues which it involves it will give enthusiastic support. It is to be expected that those professional politicians who affect to represent moderate Liberalism will look upon it with scant favour, but moderate Liberals in the country are fast rallying to the support of the party which offers the sole hope of saving the country from the Radical revolution which is threatened.

The situation of affairs in the East remains practically unchanged, and the risk that the whole Eastern question may be reopened has been in no degree lessened during the past week. Little difficulty would be experienced in obtaining the consent of the Sublime Porte to, and the acquiescence of the Great Powers in, the union of Bulgaria and Eastern Roumelia under Prince Alexander. The danger of a disturbance of the European peace arises from the wanton action that is threatened by Servia acting in accord with Greece. The pretension of Servia that compensation is required for the presumed disturbance of the equilibrium in the Balkan Peninsula, owing to the revolution in Roumelia, is one that cannot be seriously supported. It is difficult to assume that it has been put forward, or will be persisted in, except with the countenance of some more powerful State. And yet it does not appear that Austria has anything to gain at the present time by precipitating an outbreak of hostilities in the Balkan Peninsula. In the meantime, Turkey is rapidly arming and making the necessary military preparations to defend its territory against the hostile movements which are menaced. If Servia, provokes a conflict, the results of its aggression are likely to be as disastrous as during its last campaign against Turkey, and it is to be hoped that Servia will on this occasion be left to endure the consequences of defeat. The danger of the situation in the East is that vaster ambitions may regard the present time as opportune for their realisation. The policy of England has been aptly indicated by Lord Salisbury in his speech. It is a policy which, it may be hoped, is secure of the support of Englishmen of all parties. To maintain the European peace, to assist the development of the rising nationalities of the East, to uphold the Turkish Empire so far as it can be upheld with advantage to Europe and to civilisation, and to guard the Imperial interests of Great Britain in the conflict of international ambitions, are objects which, all Englishmen will agree, are the first duties of Her Majesty's Government at the present crisis.

The leap in the dark on which the French Republicans ventured when they abandoned *scrutin d'arrondissement* for *scrutin de liste* has ended in their signal discomfiture. The change in the electoral system was made in the anticipation that it would promote the interests and consolidate the power of the Republicans. The results of the first elections held under it have been to shatter the Republican party and to menace the existence of the Republic. At the elections held on Sunday last the Conservatives carried no less than 187 seats, whilst the Republicans and Radicals between them have secured only 136 seats. In 213 cases a second ballot will take place on Sunday week, none of the candidates having gained sufficient majorities. In most of the second ballots Republicans of various shades of opinion will doubtless be successful, the incomplete results being due to the divisions in the Republican camp. But already the Conservatives have gained ninety-six seats, and have secured the entire representation of twenty-three out of the ninety departments of France. The crushing defeat of the Republicans has been the more impressive from the fact that it was wholly unexpected. A fresh illustration has been afforded of the utter ignorance in which the shrewdest politicians are left as to the movement of opinion under a democratic suffrage. The cause of the Republican reverse are, however, not far to seek. Seven years of Republican government have sufficed to fill the French people with hatred and contempt for their rulers. The experience of France under M. Grevy and his various Ministers has been much the same as that of England during the last five years under Mr. Gladstone. Abroad there has been a policy of shame and slaughter, at home a domestic policy that threatened all interests and all classes, that persecuted the Church, that was hostile to religious education, and held out in the future the menace of a system of public plunder. The folly and incapacity with which the country was governed were brought home to all by the large increase of the public debt and the vast augmentation of the annual expenditure. The present revolt of the French constituencies has had the effect of destroying the faith in the inevitable permanence of Republican institutions which was beginning to grow up in France. Nothing succeeds like success, and the Monarchical cause, relieved from the despondency of past reverses, is likely to make rapid strides towards conciliating the support of the French masses.

The speeches that have been delivered during the electoral campaign this week have attracted little public attention in consequence of the absorbing interest of Lord Salisbury's declarations at Newport. Sir Charles Dilke has solaced himself during his honeymoon by addressing the electors of Chelsea in a speech which was chiefly devoted to the reiteration of the doctrines that Mr. Chamberlain has spent the recess in developing. Sir Charles Dilke was especially emphatic on the necessity of the overthrow of the Church and the abolition of the House of Lords. Mr. Trevelyan has also been delivering one of the dull essays which he from time to time inflicts upon any Radical audience that has the patience to listen to him, in which he contrives to show how much sentiment and how little sense a Radical Cabinet Minister can be possessed of. Lord Kimberley, too, has taken an opportunity of indicating that he does not intend to be left behind in the rapid development of Radical opinion amongst his colleagues. Like Sir William Harcourt, Lord Kimberley is anxious to show that no inconvenient discordance of views will prevent his holding office in any Ministry of which Mr. Chamberlain may pull the strings. Public opinion is not likely to be very greatly affected by mere oratory at present. It has something more important than phrases to guide its decisions. Mr. Chamberlain has made it quite clear that the General Election is to decide the fate of the Church, of the House of Lords, and of the British Constitution, and that it is also to decide whether the rich are to be plundered for the benefit of the poor. These are clear issues, on which all the eloquence in the world will do little to aid the elector to make up his mind.

THE NATIONAL PROGRAMME.

The speech which Lord Salisbury delivered at Newport on Wednesday is invested with a significance far beyond that attaching to an ordinary utterance even of the Prime Minister of the British Empire. It was a formal and explicit enunciation on the part of the Conservative Government of the policy on which they base their claim to receive the confidence of the country at the coming Elections. And, considering the crisis in its history at which the nation has now arrived, the importance of the occasion can hardly be exaggerated. The English people stands at the present moment at what may be called the parting of two roads. On the one hand they are invited to direct their course along the path of political and social Revolution—a path that leads, as we believe, to Anarchy and Ruin: on the other they are warned of the danger of forsaking that course of wise and sensible progress which has brought peace and prosperity in the past—the course in which alone, to quote Lord Salisbury's words, "their real interest lies, and in "the direction of which is to be found the "true honour and glory and the permanence "of the Empire to which we are proud to "belong." It is true, as Lord Salisbury impressed upon his hearers, that the success of the Conservative National party "needs the "work of many hands." But the humblest worker in the good cause will be strengthened and encouraged in his work by studying the bold and outspoken, yet withal sober and sensible, utterances of the Tory Leader. The inspiriting effects of Lord Salisbury's precise and definite explanation of Conservative policy will, we are sure, be fully felt in the coming campaign. The speech was in every way worthy of so great an occasion. Both in matter and in manner it was admirably adapted to its avowed purpose—"to bring "home to the minds of the vast multitudes "who have not given their attention to poli-"tical questions the real facts of the case, to "strip off the gaudy promise of many a seduc-"tive programme; and to show them facts as "they are."

We have dealt fully elsewhere with those of Lord Salisbury's observations which bore reference to foreign politics. Of topics of domestic interest it is natural that the subject of Ireland should first claim our attention. To the Irish policy of the Government, as our readers well know, we have been unable from the first to accord our support; and while we rejoice now to observe what seems a distinct improvement in the attitude of the Government with respect to this question, we find in the Prime Minister's own speech the fullest justification of everything we have written on the subject. Lord Salisbury admitted that he had not many words to say about Ireland; but what he did say was very much to the point. He declared most emphatically the fixed purpose of the Government not to depart from the clear and distinct tradition of the Conservative party. "We look," he said, "upon the integrity of the Empire as a matter "more important than almost any other politi-"cal consideration that could be named; "and we could not regard with favour any "proposal which, directly or indirectly, "menaced that which is the guarantee of "England's position among the nations of the "world." Lord Salisbury pointedly warns Mr. Parnell of the utter futility of any hope that the Tory party will consent to a mere Federal union with Ireland; and he definitively and decisively insists that to maintain the integrity of the Empire must undoubtedly be the first policy of the Conservatives with respect to Ireland. In common, as we are convinced, with the vast majority of the Tory party, we welcome these explicit and satisfactory assurances of the Prime Minister, and we trust that they, and not the rash and indiscreet words spoken by certain other members of the Government, may be taken to represent the real Ministerial policy. We trust that we have now heard the last of the employment by Cabinet Ministers of language that laid the Conservative Government fairly open to the taunt that they were trying to outbid the Radicals for the support of the Irish Party of Sedition. Not less satisfactory than Lord Salisbury's general statement of Irish policy is his declaration of Ministers' intention to enforce firmly and promptly those remedies provided by law for the suppression of boycotting, which has of late revived to so alarming an extent. It is to the credit of the Government that no less than thirty-five prosecutions for boycotting are now pending; and we are willing to believe that the Irish Administration is doing its best, considering the difficulties of getting evidence upon such a subject. And if we read Lord Salisbury's assurances aright, it is the intention of the Government, should the necessity arise, to ask Parliament for further powers to protect individual liberty from this monstrous tyranny of a monstrous conspiracy. That at least we take to be Lord Salisbury's meaning when he says, "I admit "in the fullest and frankest manner that a "Parliament possessing a full mandate, and a "Government leading that Parliament, are "bound above everything else to exhaust "every possible remedy in order that men may "pursue, free from illegal molestation, their "industry each in his own station of life." As to the non-renewal of the Crimes Act, we need not repeat the opinions we have often expressed on the subject. Lord Salisbury pleads that it would have been impossible to renew the Crimes Act with one hand at a time when with the other you had just handed over supreme power to the great masses of the Irish people. To express by the Reform Act the very confidence in them which by the renewal of the Crimes Act you would declare they did not deserve, would have been the height of inconsistency. The argument is, no doubt, a plausible one; but we must be excused for observing that the conclusion to which it leads us is a feeling of intense astonishment that the Conservative Leaders should ever have consented to the wholesale enfranchisement of classes who are the hotbed of Irish sedition. It may perhaps be admitted that, for several reasons, it was impracticable to renew the Crimes Act. If that had been the only argument employed to justify its abandonment, the Government case would have stood more favourably. But the Ministerial contention was, not that the Crimes Act *could not*, but that it *ought not*, to be renewed—two wholly different things. To us it still seems obvious that to contend that the Crimes Act was not effective is to fly in the face of all the evidence on the subject.

On the question of Local Government, the Prime Minister is fully justified in asserting that the traditional policy of the Tory Party has always been opposed to centralisation. In the opinion of the Government the time has come to hand over to local county authorities many of the powers now wielded by the Local Government Board. Joined to that reform, Lord Salisbury desires to rectify the unfair incidence of local rates by providing that all, in proportion to their ability, should contribute to the expenses of Local Government—a burden that at present falls only on those whose property happens to be invested in land or houses. Closely connected with this is what Lord Salisbury designates "the "burning question of Sunday Closing." In London and the greater part of England any attempt to enforce Sunday Closing would inevitably meet with failure; but in Scotland, Ireland, Cornwall, and parts of Wales, a practical unanimity exists in favour of Sunday Closing. Lord Salisbury is in favour of allowing each locality to decide the matter for itself. But though the closing of publichouses on Sunday is thus held to be a legitimate subject for Local Option, the Prime Minister was careful to guard himself from being supposed to favour the doctrine that a majority of "non-thirsty souls" has any right to prescribe that "the thirsty souls shall have "nothing to drink." That, as he further remarked, is a claim that "trenches upon the "elementary liberties of mankind." If once individual liberties are sacrificed in the matter of alcohol, there is, he contended, a danger lest our freedom in other matters should have to be sacrificed also, and that the doctrines of civil and religious liberty should gradually be whittled away.

Most valuable and timely were Lord Salisbury's remarks on the Land Question and his merciless criticisms of Mr. Chamberlain's projects of confiscation. The disappearance of the yeomanry is to be deplored, but Lord Salisbury covered with well-merited ridicule the idea that every evil can be remedied by Act of Parliament. Nothing could be more absurd than the pretence that the Conservative party is opposed to measures for facilitating the transfer of land. The landed interest are not more enamoured of lawyers' bills than other people. The difficulty of land transfer lies in the necessity, first, of indicating clearly what is the piece of land to be sold; and, secondly, of proving the seller's right of ownership and right of sale. The Lord Chancellor is rather more sanguine than the Prime Minister of the possibility of finding a legislative remedy, and intends to introduce a measure for establishing a complete and compulsory system of registration. The experiment is, at any rate, worth trying. But nothing could add more to the difficulty, and therefore to the cost, of transferring land than such a scheme as that of Mr. Jesse Collings, for forcing every holder of land to prove that within the last fifty years the estate had not included any portion of what had been common land. The absurdly unpractical character of such a proposal is self-evident; and Lord Salisbury expended some merriment over the crude notions of "inventive cockneys "who know nothing about land but what "they have read in magazines." One of the admirable portions of Lord Salisbury's speech was his proposal to empower (not, of course, to compel) clergymen who possess glebe-lands, and charitable foundations depending upon small bequests of land, to sell the land on which their income depends, and to invest the proceeds in Consols. By this means there would

be brought into the market a large quantity of land all over the country—land peculiarly suited for gardens and allotments—land which, at all events, is ill-placed in its present condition, and would be better placed in the hands of any private owner. A more masterly and statesmanlike proposal was never made. It would immensely benefit the clergy and charitable institutions concerned; while, at the same time, it would meet the present outcry for allotments. No doubt the Radical agitators will dislike and denounce the scheme, because it will test the sincerity of their professions. As to Mr. CHAMBERLAIN's ridiculous and unpractical scheme for dealing with the Land question, it is thoroughly exposed and refuted by Lord SALISBURY in his happiest style. It is shown that Mr. CHAMBERLAIN's proposal to empower the local authority to take land compulsorily, and to let this land in small farms, could not possibly be made to pay. The purchase money would be borrowed by the local authority at 4 per cent.; whereas nobody ever succeeded in making more than 2 per cent. out of the ownership of land. The difference would have to be paid out of the rates—in other words, it would be made a present to the man who was put in occupation of the land. Thus we arrive at a revival of the practice, abandoned fifty years ago, of giving outdoor relief in aid of rent. Moreover, supposing that the scheme could be made to work profitably, there would be a great competition for these allotments, and the choice of occupants would be in the hands of the local authority; and thus the door would be opened to political favouritism and corruption. The scheme, as Lord SALISBURY justly observes, is "the Budget of the Caucus; "it is the financial proposition by which the "machinery of Birmingham is to be kept "going"—intended to "bind the country "voters by the dearest pecuniary interests to "vote as the wire-pullers of Birmingham shall tell them." It is obvious too that, as regards the persons from whom the land is taken, the power of taking the land is a tremendous weapon to place in the hands of the local authority, and one which is sure to be used not only against large, but also against small, landowners for political objects. Mr. CHAMBERLAIN's proposition offers no real relief to the labouring man. If men with capital are unable to make the occupation of land pay, it is impossible to suppose that men without capital will be more successful. The proposal is simply, as Lord SALISBURY declares, "a most ingenious, care-"fully thought-out scheme of political domina-"tion, to which the instincts of free men will "offer a firm and unhesitating resistance."

On the subject of Free Education, Lord SALISBURY is, as might have been expected, wholly opposed to Mr. CHAMBERLAIN's doctrines. He sees no reason why parents who are perfectly able to pay for the schooling of their own children should add to the public burdens by obtaining a free education for them. Besides, the motive of the scheme is, as Mr. MORLEY has indicated, to get rid of religious education by starving out the Voluntary schools.

Lord SALISBURY's concluding observations on Disestablishment deserve the thoughful attention of all Churchmen, but especially of Liberal Churchmen, to whom he earnestly appeals to ward off so great a disaster to the nation. Surely, observes the PRIME MINISTER, "those who think that the interests "of the Church are the dearest matter upon "the whole field of political controversy with "which they could have to do will consider "what course they will pursue, now that it is "announced in no obscure accents that their "Leader is prepared to desert them on the first "convenient opportunity." The duty of the Conservatives is in any case plain. "At all "events, we can hold no ambiguous language "on this matter. To us it is a matter of life "and death. Our party is bound up with "the maintenance of the Established and "Endowed Churches of this island. We "can admit on these matters no compro-"mise, no hope that we shall support any pro-"posal for the overthrow or for the injury of "that which we hold dear. The maintenance "of the framework of our Constitution, the up-"holding of the rights of property, and, more "than all, the support of the sacred institution "—its support by ancient endowments, and by "the recognition of the authority of the State "—which now for generation after generation, "in Scotland and in England, has held up the "power of truth, and has maintained the truths "of Christianity before the world, to that as a "party, as honest men, and as Christians, we "are irrevocably bound."

THE EASTERN CRISIS.

Lord SALISBURY in his speech at Newport had little difficulty in exposing the utter baselessness of the assertion frequently made of late by Radical orators that the rising in Eastern Roumelia has frustrated the policy of the Treaty of Berlin. Even if the allegation were true, the taunts of these pettifogging politicians would simply prove that they are incapable of taking a lofty, statesmanlike view of our foreign relations, and that they see in them merely something out of which party capital can be made at home. As the matter stands, however, the sneers indulged in by Mr. CHAMBERLAIN, Mr. SHAW LEFEVRE, and other Radical speakers are simply pointless. The Berlin Treaty secured for this country what Lord BEACONSFIELD claimed that it had secured—"Peace with "Honour." It delivered us from the imminent danger of a war with Russia, and effected an honourable arrangement which has, on the least favourable showing, lasted for seven years. If the Berlin Treaty and the British diplomatists who contributed so largely to the settlement embodied in it had done no more than this, we should still have every reason to feel thankful. But, in point of fact, there is not the slightest ground for asserting that the policy of the Berlin Treaty has been frustrated. Lord SALISBURY points out, as we ourselves did a week ago, that what has now taken place has not restored the Great Bulgaria of the Treaty of San Stefano. The destruction of the big Bulgaria which Russia had endeavoured to establish was one of the principal objects of the Congress at Berlin, and the united Bulgaria is a very different thing from the Great Bulgaria that extended to the coast of the Ægean. Again, as Lord SALISBURY shows, it is an entire misrepresentation of the intentions of the Berlin Congress to allege that it endeavoured to repress the nationalities of the Balkans. The object was to secure their being true and real nationalities, so that the Christian populations which gradually became emancipated from Turkey should grow up into States representing the actual character of the nations composing them. "Treaties," as Lord SALISBURY well observed, "do not affect to over-rule the "genuine impulses of populations." Though we may desire to "uphold the Turkish "Empire wherever it can be genuinely and "healthily upheld," yet, on the other hand, "wherever its rule is proved by events to be "inconsistent with the welfare of populations" our policy is "to cherish and foster strong "self-sustaining nationalities." Seven years have passed away since the Berlin Congress sat, and it may well be the case that the two Bulgarias are now entitled to effect a union with each other. But Lord SALISBURY has a right to claim for Europe the credit of having enabled them to develope the strength and character of a nation. Meanwhile, the union of the two Bulgarias no more invalidates the Treaty of Berlin than the union of the two Roumanias invalidated the Treaty of Paris, or the separation of the Netherlands and Belgium invalidated the Treaty of Vienna.

There seems no reason to doubt that the SULTAN is willing, and has offered, to appoint Prince ALEXANDER Governor-General of Eastern Roumelia. It is plain, however, that a mere personal union of the two provinces under one Governor could not satisfy the requirements of the position. For economical and commercial reasons especially, the complete union of the two Bulgarias is extremely desirable. It is so far reassuring to obtain from the PRIME MINISTER the expression of a hope that the Great Powers are agreed that trouble and disturbance ought to go no farther, and that their influence will be directed to securing that result. If once peace is broken, the very first to suffer may probably be the newly-liberated nationalities themselves. The interests of the smaller nations are only too liable to be sacrificed to those exigencies of their large and more powerful neighbours, which the progress of military events is likely to develope. That is a consideration which might well restrain the warlike ardour of the various Balkan States. Yet, in the present position of affairs, there seems but little reason to hope that it will have that desirable effect. It seems more than probable that the King of SERVIA may be compelled by his people, and against his better judgment, to seek by force of arms for territorial compensation for the aggrandisement of Bulgaria. King MILAN appears to be in the predicament of having to choose between a declaration of war and a domestic revolution. Unless coerced by some external force, it is impossible to doubt that of the two alternatives he will choose the former. It is of course in the power of Austria to restrain Servia: the question is whether Austria will exercise that power. Servia is the great instrument for working out Austria's own designs in the Balkan Peninsula. Austria herself is destined at no very distant period to extend her empire as far as the Ægean. She will certainly reach Salonica: of Constantinople nothing need be said now. And Servia is for Austria a kind of advanced guard. Austrian diplomacy has admirably succeeded in securing important friendships throughout the Peninsula—as, for example, in the case of Roumania, where Austrian influence immensely preponderates over that of Russia. But Austria's special *protégé* is Servia; and we may be sure that nothing but the very strongest counter-considerations could induce Austria to act against her own interests by bringing restraint to bear on Servia.

Such a counter-consideration, nevertheless, probably exists. There is good reason to believe that Germany is bent upon preserving peace at all costs. The influence of Germany will be forthcoming to induce Austria to take the necessary steps for repressing the warlike tendencies of her smaller neighbours. It will, perhaps, be difficult for Austria to adopt this policy; but unless it is adopted she might risk the loss of the German alliance, and with it the promise of German aid against Russia—Austria's great rival in the Balkan Peninsula. It is, of course, to be understood that the progress of Austria is only postponed. Lord SALISBURY's language as to the desirability of maintaining the Turkish Empire was carefully guarded. It is the policy of England to uphold it "wherever it can be genuinely and healthily "upheld;" that is to say, the interests of Great Britain demand the maintenance of the Turkish Empire until some other Power is ready to take its place as a barrier against Russia. The final disappearance of Turkish rule from Europe is only a question of time—perhaps of a very short time; and it behoves British statesmen to look ahead into the not-distant future. The only two possible successors to the Turkish dominion are Russia and Austria. Russia is our natural foe in the East, and that consideration alone would point to the establishment of Austrian supremacy in the Balkan Peninsula as an object of British policy. But there are other reasons why the extension of Austrian power should be viewed with favour by England. The Dual Monarchy has peculiar claims on the sympathy of Englishmen, and especially of English Conservatives. Her weight in Europe has always been thrown into the scale of Law and Order as against the Revolution; and the strength and prosperity of both Austro-Hungary and Germany are a safeguard against the mischievous influences of semi-barbarian Russia on the one hand, and of revolutionary France on the other. For these reasons we may certainly expect to find that under a Conservative Administration British policy will be distinctly favourable to the growth of Austrian power in the East.

THE FRENCH ELECTIONS.

The French Conservatives are to be cordially congratulated upon the sound and sensible tactics by which they have been enabled to win an important electoral victory. The result has, we are glad to observe, caused the most lively dismay in the Republican camp. That the Republican organs in the press fully appreciate the significance of recent events is proved by the doleful tone of their comments, and their despairing appeals for union among Liberals of every shade of opinion. The chagrin and rage of the Radical mob of Paris have been displayed in the usual fashion, by repeated threats of physicial violence against its political opponents, and a nefarious attempt to tamper with the polling arrangements for the Election. The exultation of the Royalists, though perfectly natural and justifiable under the circumstances, might be thought to be based on an exaggerated view of the importance of their successes; but the evident disappointment and wrath of the Republican faction afford clear and unimpeachable indication of the true bearings of the situation. There is no sort of difficulty in ascertaining what they really think and feel about the Conservative victory. And as the French Republicans may be trusted to have formed a tolerably accurate estimate of their own political position, we may be excused for preferring to be guided by their view of it rather than by that of certain English journalists, who seek to minimise the meaning of the Republican disaster. It is calculated that out of the total of 584 Deputies composing the French House of Assembly at least 200 will belong to the Conservative party—a fact the importance of which is enhanced when it is remembered that the Republican majority is split up into numerous and mutually hostile sections. How great has been the force of the Conservative reaction appears from a comparison of the Conservative party's present position with that which it occupied in the last Chamber, where its whole voting power was represented by about 90 votes. Thus the Monarchists will gain over a hundred seats, and will more than double their former strength. The Monarchical party will now be the largest united Parliamentary group, and can count upon the unhealed and apparently incurable dissensions existing in the ranks of their opponents to make their own influence felt to an extent unknown for many years past. This is a result well calculated to inspirit the friends of Order in France; and we are quite unable to perceive why they are to be blamed for making the most of their triumph. So far from their jubilations laying them open to the charge of being "indiscreet," it is probably their best policy to magnify their electoral successes, and thus to inspire confidence and enthusiasm in their party throughout the country. After years of apathy and inaction, the Conservative classes, who, as we have always believed, form the vast majority of the French nation, seem to be awakening at last from their lethargy; and it is desirable to employ every means of spurring them into activity. The newly-acquired knowledge of their own strength may well encourage Conservatives who previously were inclined to abstain from voting to take an active part in the electoral contests still pending, many of which will be decided by small majorities.

The causes that have led to a Conservative triumph are not far to seek. They may, indeed, be said to lie on the surface. The French Radicals, like their allies and sympathisers here, have shamefully abused the confidence of their countrymen; they have mismanaged affairs at home and abroad; they have wantonly outraged the national feeling in regard to Religion; and now they are threatening the rights of property, and devising schemes of plunder and spoliation. We in this country have for some years been suffering from a similar plague; and it needs no very great effort of the imagination on the part of Englishmen to realise the disgust and contempt with which all respectable Frenchmen view the past proceedings of their rulers. The Radicals, emboldened by success, have put too great a strain upon the patience of the French people, and there is no cause for wonder in the fact that it has now reached the breaking point. It is true that the Conservatives will still be in an actual minority in the Chamber. But the important point is that the process of turning that minority into a majority has visibly begun, and begun at a very rapid rate. Nor is it to be imagined that it will stop where it is now. The movement of reaction will certainly continue, and will gather strength as it proceeds. That is a fact which is quite as well known to the Republicans as it is to their opponents, and their alarm is not at all out of proportion to the gravity of the position in which they find themselves. An examination of the electoral returns establishes several highly significant conclusions. It is evident, for instance, that an enormous proportion of those who abstained from voting at former Elections have on this occasion felt it incumbent on them to exercise the franchise. It is equally obvious that while the Republicans have in many places polled far fewer votes than they obtained in 1882, the Conservatives have received many more; and this is true even in the case of numerous localities where the Republicans have managed to escape actual defeat. It has been calculated that in twenty-seven departments, although the Conservatives have not elected their candidate, they have nevertheless polled more than 500,000 votes in excess of the numbers recorded in their favour at the last Election.

One of the most interesting questions suggested by the result of the French Elections still remains to be considered. It is agreed on all sides that the French people as a whole are opposed to the doctrines of the Socialist and ultra-Radical party, and that the expression of feeling which we have just witnessed is intended as a protest against them. But there is nothing novel in this attitude of public opinion in France. On no occasion have the extreme Radicals received the support of a majority of the nation. Hitherto it has been the Moderate Liberals who seemed to possess the confidence of the electorate. Their dislike of Radicalism has induced them to support, not the Conservatives, but the Moderate Liberals. And

the entirely new and chiefly noteworthy feature of the Elections now in progress is the withdrawal of this confidence from the Moderate Liberals and its transfer to the Conservatives. The fact is patent: what is the explanation of it? Why are the Moderate Liberals distrusted? It is because they have been tried and found wanting. It is because experience has shown conclusively that Opportunism cannot be relied upon as a bulwark against the Anarchical Revolution, but that, on the contrary, it habitually betrays the interests it was commissioned to guard and plays into the hands of the ultra-Radicals. Hence the conviction gains ground among the great mass of moderate men throughout the country—the classes who are not wedded to any abstract theory of government, but who desire a policy which will secure peace and economy, law and order, stability of the social edifice, security of property, and at least some sort of fair play for the Church—that the objects they have at heart can only be obtained under a Conservative *régime*. From being Moderate Liberals they have become Moderate Conservatives; and it so happens that, at the very time when their belief in Moderate Republicanism has been rudely shaken, the prospect of their obtaining what they want under a Moderate Monarchy is considerably increased. It does not seem much open to doubt that the strong current of Conservative opinion now manifested is running chiefly in a Royalist direction. It is in fact primarily to the Comte de Paris that men turn as the leading exponent of sober and moderate Conservative opinion. Thus the representative of the old Conservatism which looks forward to the Restoration of the Legitimate Monarchy is also the hope of the newer Conservatism that is attracting into its ranks those who have hitherto supported a moderate Liberalism. It does not seem, therefore, too large a conclusion to draw from the events of the last few days in France, that the heterogeneous political compound known as Moderate Liberalism or Conservative Republicanism is getting to be generally regarded as worn-out and effete. Something at least has been accomplished towards the restoration in the not very distant future of Monarchy in the person of King Philippe VII.

LATEST NEWS.

Athens, Oct. 8.

Most of the foreign Ministers here strongly urge the Hellenic Government to discontinue its warlike preparations.

Philippopolis, Oct. 9.

Several Bulgarian officers have returned here from Russia, and have been appointed to various branches of the service. The recently-organised battalions and all the volunteer corps took the oath of allegiance to Prince Alexander this morning. Up to the present no volunteers from Russia have arrived here.

Tamatave, Sept. 26.

Fighting has taken place at Passandava Bay between the Hovas and the French troops, but without any decisive result.

The French lost twenty-one killed and wounded.

The loss of the Hovas was 200 killed and wounded.

Rome, Oct. 9.

The Pope yesterday conferred with several persons on the Caroline Islands question.

The report published by some newspapers that the Pope has written to the Comte de Paris expressing his gratification at the result of the French elections is declared to be without foundation. It is added that the Vatican expects no concessions from the new French Chamber.

St. Petersburg, Oct. 9.

The *Viedomosti* to-day states that the Ministry of Marine will shortly submit to the Council of the Empire a proposal that Sebastopol shall be made the military port instead of Nicolaieff.

Sydney, Oct. 9.

The statement that the Hon. Alexander Stuart had been appointed Agent General of New South Wales in London was erroneous.

SOCIETY.

A marriage has been arranged between Sir Richard Williams-Bulkeley, Bart., of Baron Hill, and Lady Magdalen Yorke, the second daughter of the Earl of Hardwicke.

Also between Capt. Vere Bernard Oldham, R.N., of H.M.S. *Revenge*, and Agnes Dorothy, youngest daughter of the late Capt. Edward Francis Fergusson, of the Indian Navy.

Also between the Rev. Frederick Harvey, rector of Bohnhurst, Bedfordshire, and Miss Catherine Parker-Jervis, eldest daughter of the late Mr. Edward J. Parker-Jervis, of The Pyrehill, Stone, and granddaughter of the Hon. E. S. Parker-Jervis, of Ashton Hall, Sutton Coldfield.

On Thursday morning, at Staindrop Church, Lady Mary Primrose, sister of the Earl of Rosebery and daughter of the Duchess of Cleveland, was married to Mr. Henry W. Hope, of Luffness, N.B., formerly of the Grenadier Guards. The guests staying at Raby Castle included the Hon. Mrs. Hope and the Misses Hope, the Earl and Countess of Rosebery and children, Earl and Countess Stanhope, Lord and Lady Leconfield and children, Hon. and Rev. Henry and Mrs. Stanhope, Hon. Philip Stanhope and Countess Tolstoy, Hon. Joseph and Mrs. Maxwell Scott, Mr. Herbert Hope, Miss Josephine Hope, the Hon. Bouverie Primrose and Miss F. Primrose, Vicomte Léon de Janzé, Colonel Philip Smith, Mrs. George Mercer-Henderson, Mr. J. Banks Stanhope, and Mr. Henry Primrose. Colonel Philip Smith (Grenadier Guards) acted as best man. There were seven bridesmaids—Miss Lucy Hope, sister of the bridegroom; the Ladies Sybil and Margaret Primrose, daughters of the Earl and Countess of Rosebery; and the Hon. Mary, Hon. Maud, and Hon. Margaret Wyndham, children of Lord and Lady Leconfield, nieces of the bride, and Miss Josephine Hope, cousin of the bridegroom. The Hon. Reginald and Hon. Hugh Wyndham assisted as pages. The bride was given away by the Duke of Cleveland, her stepfather. The Bishop of Durham officiated, assisted by the Rev. Harry Curteis Lipscomb, M.A., rector of Staindrop, Darlington, and domestic chaplain to the Duke of Cleveland. Afterwards the Duke and Duchess of Cleveland gave the wedding breakfast at Raby Castle. Early in the afternoon Mr. and Lady Mary Hope took their departure for Castle Howard, the seat of the Carlisle family in Yorkshire. The Duke of Cleveland's present to his stepdaughter consisted of a cheque for £1,000, and the Earl of Rosebery gave his sister a cheque for £2,000.

FOREIGN INTELLIGENCE.

FRANCE.—The elections took place on Sunday, resulting in a victory for the Conservative coalition. The results of the voting in the Departments are as follows: Conservatives elected, 187; Republicans elected, 131; ballotings, 227.

The falling-off in Republican votes compared with 1881 is in many departments very striking:—

"In Ain, the numbers fall from 58,000 to 34,000; in Ariège, from 37,000 to 28,000; in Bouches-du-Rhône, from 62,000 to 53,000; in Maine-et-Loire, from 54,000 to 46,000; in Haute-Marne, from 41,000 to 34,000; in Oise, from 58,000 to 47,000; in Saône-et-Loire, from 92,000 to 75,000; in Eure-et-Loire, from 55,000 to 40,000; and in Somme, from 78,000 to 59,000. Some of these departments were not contested, or not seriously contested, in 1881; but in others the Reactionary vote has correspondingly increased. Thus, in Nord, it has risen from 71,000 to 162,000; in Mayenne, from 18,000 to 41,000; and in Pas-de-Calais, from 60,000 to 100,000. The abstentions are evidently much less numerous than they were four years ago. Even in departments still held by the Republicans, their vote has fallen off. In Seine-Inférieure, for example, it has dwindled from 97,000 to 80,000. Twenty-two departments are entirely Reactionary; fifteen are entirely Republican. In twenty-two departments some seats are already filled up, while others require a second ballot; in twenty-nine no candidate obtained an absolute majority.

The Ministers have agreed to wait for the result of the second ballots before considering the question of resignation.

TURKEY.—The first meeting of the Ambassadors to consider the events in Eastern Roumelia lasted three hours and a half, and although it was decided to keep the proceedings secret, it has transpired that there was some difference of opinion. A second meeting was held on Monday, when it was agreed to be necessary to ask for further instructions from their respective Governments. The Ambassadors, in the memorandum upon which they agreed, are said to have confined themselves to indicating the tenor of the communication to be addressed to Turkey and Bulgaria, with the object of preventing any conflict, without, however, suggesting any solution of the question. The general opinion at the Embassies is that the union of Roumelia with Bulgaria will have to be respected, but that measures will be taken to secure the sovereignty of Turkey and the payment of the tribute. Under the influence of the Sultan, says a correspondent, the general aspect of affairs is more hopeful. His Majesty, while strenuously maintaining the Berlin Treaty, is opposed to war if it can be avoided. Troops are nevertheless being sent in considerable numbers to Salonica and Mustapha Pasha.

EGYPT.—Colonel Chermside has received the following telegram from Marcopoli Bey, dated Asmira, *viâ* Aden, September 29:—Arrived here at noon. Chalka Raza, an Abyssinian General, who had arrived at Kufit on the 27th inst., reports that on the 23rd inst. Ras Aloola met the rebel army under Osman Digma at Kufit, which was strongly fortified. The battle began in the morning and lasted until noon. The rebels were defeated, 3,000 of their number being left on the field. The friendly Beni Amer and El Gudru tribes killed the rebels who took to flight. The Abyssinians suffered heavily. Ras Aloola had his horse killed under him. Osman Digma was killed, and his body has been identified by several persons. Some reinforcements which the rebels near Kassala had despatched to Osman Digma were taken in flank near El Gurden and annihilated." Colonel Chermside has also received an autograph letter from Ras Aloola announcing his victory over the rebels.

AUSTRIA.—The Austrian Minister of Education has invited the foreign Governments to send representatives to an International Conference, which is to meet at Vienna at the end of this month, for the purpose of establishing an international standard pitch in music.

HUNGARY.—M. Tisza replied in the Hungarian Diet on Saturday to a question which had been put to him concerning the events in Eastern Roumelia, and stated that, although the movement in favour of union was known to exist, the outbreak of the conspiracy took all the European Cabinets by surprise. There was not, he added, any idea of annexing Bosnia or Herzegovina, and still less did Austria-Hungary intend to complicate matters by occupying Turkish territory.

RUSSIA.—The Czar received the Bulgarian Deputation on Saturday. The Envoys describe the manner of the Russian Emperor to them as cordial; and they return home with the assurance of his good will, and the hope of a speedy settlement of the Roumelian Question.

GREECE.—It is announced from Athens that the remainder of the Greek army reserve will be called out immediately, and that great activity prevails in the navy yard at Salamis.

DENMARK.—At Tuesday's sitting of the Danish Folkething the Minister of Finance, in presenting the Budget for 1886-87, estimated the revenue at 55,500,000 and the expenditure at 65,000,000 kroners. There was consequently a deficit of 9,500,000 kroners, due to the fact that Government demands for meeting certain important requirements had been postponed from year to year. The deficit, however, was not of much consequence, as the accounts of late years showed a surplus of about 10,000,000 kroners annually, and the cash in the Treasury amounted to 58,000,000 kroners.

IRELAND.

Mr. Parnell was present at Wicklow on Monday at the first of the County Conventions to be held in Ireland for the selection of Nationalist candidates. Subsequently addressing a public meeting, Mr. Parnell said that what had happened since he last spoke in Ireland had increased his confidence that they would succeed in obtaining an independent Parliament for Ireland. Having referred to the declarations on this subject in Mr. Gladstone's Manifesto and Mr. Chamberlain's speeches, he claimed that the Irish Parliament of the future should have the power to protect native industries. Referring to the disloyalty of Ireland, he said:—"Am I not entitled to assume that one of the roots of this disaffection, of this feeling of disloyalty, is the assumption by England of the management of our affairs? My advice to English statemen considering this question would be this:—Trust the Irish people altogether, or trust them not at all. Give with full and with open hand. Give our people power to legislate upon our domestic concerns, and you may depend upon one thing—that the desire for separation, the means of winning separation at least, will not be increased or intensified—whatever power English rulers may have of drawing to themselves the affections of the Irish people by destroying the abominable system of legislative union between the two countries—by conceding fully and freely to Ireland the right to manage her own affairs." While declaring it was impossible to give a guarantee that a demand for the separation of Ireland from England would not be made, he said that the English statesman who should give Ireland the power to manage her own domestic concerns would remove one of the greatest perils of this country—a peril which otherwise might end in the destruction of the British Empire.

On Saturday last, at a meeting of the Irish Privy Council, held in Dublin, Lord Ashbourne (Lord Chancellor of Ireland), Mr. J. T. Ball, and Prince Edward of Saxe-Weimar (Commander-in-Chief of the Forces), were sworn in as Lords Justices for the Government of Ireland during the absence of the Lord-Lieutenant, who, with the Countess of Carnarvon, accompanied by Lord Porchester, and attended by Captain Byng, aide-de-camp, left Dublin on Saturday morning last, *viâ* Kingstown and Holyhead, for London.

An evicted tenant at Broom who mowed some hay for Dr. Lyons, M.P., has had the hut which was provided for him by the Land League torn down by about 3,000 persons who had assembled for the purpose. The hut was carried away in the procession and erected for an evicted tenant in another place. A meeting of the committee appointed at the recent meeting of landlords and loyalists in Cork was held on Saturday for the purpose of preparing their scheme for counteracting boycotting. Mr. Arthur Hugh Smith Barry, chairman of the committee, presided. The project will embrace the establishment in disaffected districts of centres or depôts where boycotted farmers and tradesmen will be supplied with provisions, and the necessary steps will be also taken for protecting and providing with employment those who may require it.

Boycotting has increased to such an extent in the South of Ireland that the Cork Steam Packet Company are threatened with the loss of a large share of their traffic should they convey any cattle belonging to evicted farmers. A special meeting of the shareholders has been summoned to consider the crisis.

POLITICAL AND PERSONAL.

November 17 is the date fixed for the dissolution of the present Parliament.

Viscount Halifax, as President of the English Church Union, has addressed a circular to the members in view of the approaching general election, urging them not to support candidates who are prepared to sanction Disestablishment.

Mr. Macdonell, Revising Barrister for Middlesex, has given his decision in respect to objections made to the names of shareholders in the New River Company being retained on the register of voters. He held that owners of shares, or of part shares of sufficient value, who were already on the register were entitled to vote, that claimants who derived their interest in a manner specified by the statute were also entitled to vote, and that other new claimants were not so entitled. On the last-named point notice of appeal was given.

A demonstration of the Liberals of the Eastern Counties was held at Norwich on Thursday, when, among other resolutions adopted, was one approving of Mr. Chamberlain's land reform scheme. At an evening meeting the chief speakers were Lord Kimberley (who presided) and Mr. Trevelyan. The former stated that he would support free education.

Lord Hartington, speaking at Bury on Thursday night, maintained that Free Trade had tended to produce a great increase in the prosperity of the country, and he deprecated the imposition of duties on foreign imports. He denounced as lame Lord Salisbury's Irish policy, and pointed to the revival of boycotting as proof that some provisions of the Crimes Act ought to have been renewed.

Speaking at the opening of a Conservative club at Barnsley on Thursday, Sir Richard Cross urged the importance of such institutions, and expressed his gratification that working-men would be admitted as members at a reduced cost. Referring to electoral movements, he reminded his hearers that it was now impossible to pay canvassers, and suggested the formation of district committees, who should continue their work during the general election. Alluding to the state of parties, he said the present Government had taken office only under a sense of imperative duty, and he insisted on the immense importance of the approaching general election.

Among the large number of other prominent politicians who addressed meetings on Thursday were Lord Brabourne, Lord Dunraven, Mr. Lowther, and Mr. Akers-Douglas.

Lord Iddesleigh was present on Saturday at a great Conservative demonstration held in Sherborne-park, Dorsetshire. In the course of his speech, his Lordship described this as a time for caution and prudence, and for dependence upon our own firmness and integrity, and said he did not doubt that the principles at the foundation of the Conservative foreign policy would withstand any strain that circumstances might put upon them. Their opponents had a very large and slashing programme, which included disestablishment of the Church, the abolition of the House of Lords, and the crushing out of a class of landlords, and because they did not advocate such measures they were told that they had no policy at all.

Mr. Goschen, Liberal candidate for the North-eastern Division of Edinburgh, in his address to the electors, refers to the subjects of the procedure in the House of Commons, local government, local finance, and the land laws, and says that, with a reasonable freedom as to details, he cordially concurs with what Mr. Gladstone has said on these subjects in his address to the electors of Midlothian. He expects that the solution of the local government question will not only facilitate legislative action with regard to such questions as the licensing laws, but will render the administration of the existing laws in many sanitary and other subjects more prompt, impartial, and effective. The disestablishment of the Church of Scotland, he thinks, should be treated exclusively as a Scottish question, and approached with reference to the peculiar circumstances, the history, the feelings, and the wishes of Scotland. He remarks that the depression of trade has caused the greatest anxiety, but says that the sound sense of the people will reject all remedies, however specious, which imply a return to any form of protective duties. He directs attention to the bearing upon the national welfare of our foreign and colonial policy, and promises if elected to do his utmost to discharge the duties of a Scottish representative.

Professor Beesly, at a meeting held on Monday in behalf of his candidature, explained his programme, which (he said) included the abolition of the House of Lords and the Disestablishment and Disendowment of the Church. The reference to these subjects in Mr. Gladstone's Manifesto ought not to discourage them, but ought to fill them with confidence and hope. Mr. Gladstone used moderate language, and yet signed the death-warrant of both those institutions. He admitted that so long as Mr. Gladstone was Prime Minister, as he would be in a few weeks, these two points would not be brought forward; but if it should happen, as it might probably happen, when Mr. Gladstone had been in office some time and had dealt with the four points he had to deal with, that if he was to retire from public life, then Parliament would have full opportunity of dealing with those two points.

LORD SALISBURY ON THE MINISTERIAL PROGRAMME.

Lord Salisbury addressed an enthusiastic meeting of about 10,000 persons at Newport in Monmouthshire on Wednesday night. He surveyed the whole political situation, and set forth the programme of the Conservative party. Having referred to the circumstances under which the Conservatives had taken office, and defended their conduct from the aspersions of Liberal criticism, he met Lord Hartington's charge of "gross political immorality" with the sole sarcastic expression—"He, the great maintainer of principle, who never yielded an opinion in his life"—and then challenged Mr. Chamberlain to "point out the language I used in Opposition which in office I am contradicting by my deeds." He pointed out that the Government had concluded a loan in Egypt, and were conducting to a successful issue negotiations as to the frontier of Afghanistan, in both of which enterprises their predecessors had failed. Did those who call their action slavish and submissive mean that it is the duty of statesmen who succeed to office to be false to the engagements and to disappoint the expectations which their predecessors had raised? Into the Conservative view, at least, of the duty of English statesmen such disloyalty never entered.

Lord Salisbury having discussed the Eastern crisis, turned to home politics, and ridiculed the Radical representations of what Conservatism should be, and claimed that Conservatives alone should be accepted as the exponents of Conservative opinions. As to local government—

The present Cabinet are strongly of opinion that large reforms in our local government, in the direction of increasing the power of that local government, are absolutely necessary. Now, bear in mind what a true reform in local government means. It does not only mean that the local authorities should be popularly elected, but it means that, when you have provided the proper constitution of local authority, you must provide that the local authority has sufficient powers, and that it gets those powers by diminishing the excessive and exaggerated powers which have been heaped on the central authorities in London. And that I claim to be a special Tory doctrine, which we have held through good report and evil report for many a generation. There is another reform which I have very much at heart, which I have urged so often that I do not think even Mr. Chamberlain will say that I am trespassing upon his copyright in claiming it. It is that all men, in proportion to their ability, should contribute to the expenses of local government. I have a strong feeling that the unfair incidence of rates—not in all parts of the country, but in many parts of the country—have materially aggravated the difficulties which the poor find in getting fair and decent lodging. Further, I should be inclined to entrust the local authority with the settlement of this difficult question of Sunday closing, but always on one condition: that they

should be entrusted with the permanent settlement of it—that is to say, that after two or three intervals, if they do not like what they have done, they should be at liberty to reverse their steps. For myself, although I am treading on difficult ground, I should be prepared to place the power of licensing in the hands of local authorities to the extent to which magistrates have it now.

With regard to Ireland, the first principle on which the Conservatives had always gone was to extend as far as they could to Ireland all those institutions that had been established in this country. But, Lord Salisbury said:—

I fully recognise that in the case of local institutions there is one limiting consideration which in the present state of Ireland you cannot leave out of account—namely, the fact that the population is on certain subjects deeply divided, and that it is the duty of every Government, in all matters of essential justice, to protect the minority against the majority. With respect to larger organic questions connected with Ireland I cannot say very much, though I can speak emphatically. I have nothing to say but that the traditions of our party are on this subject clear and distinct, and that you may rely upon it our party will not depart from them. We look upon the integrity of the Empire as a matter more important than almost any other political consideration that you can name, and we could not regard with favour any proposal which directly or indirectly menaced that which is the guarantee of England's position among the nations of the world. As for Mr. Parnell's notion of imperial federation, I am bound to say that I have never seen any plan or any suggestion that will give me at present the slightest ground for anticipating that it is in that direction that we shall find any satisfactory solution of the Irish problem. I wish that it may be so; but I think we shall be holding out false expectations if we avow a belief which as yet, at all events, we cannot entertain. There is no ground for saying that in the present condition—I am not speaking for the past condition—of Irish temper the Crimes Act was any restraint on outrage, and it certainly was no restraint on boycotting. I believe the truth about boycotting is this, that it depends upon a passing humour of the majority of the population. I doubt whether in any community the law has been able to offer a complete, a perfect, and a satisfactory remedy. But I believe it contains its own Nemesis within itself. Even now, the very National League find that the Frankenstein they have created threatens their interests as much as those of any other interest in the community, and that boycotting is on the decline; but, be that as it may, I admit in the fullest and frankest manner that a Parliament possessing a full mandate, and a Government leading that Parliament, are bound above everything else to exhaust every possible remedy in order that men may pursue, free from illegal molestation, their industry, each in his own station in life.

Imperial federation, apart from the Irish question, he considered to be one of the questions of the future.

Lord Salisbury pointed out the difficulties to be contended with in land-law reform, and said he had talked over the matter with the Lord Chancellor, who is more sanguine than himself.

The Lord Chancellor believes that, with a complete and compulsory system of registration, the transfer of land can be made cheap and easy. Well, with respect to that belief I will only say this—that at all events the experiment ought to be tried. There is nothing I desire more than this, if only it can be achieved. But remember that one of the absolute conditions of cheap transfer of land is a short law of prescription.

Discussing the proposals of Mr. Chamberlain and Mr. Jesse Collings at great length, Lord Salisbury pointed out that the irresistible force of economical facts is driving large tracts of the country from arable into pasture.

Is there any use, is there any wisdom, in expressing our surprise and trying to resist the process—a process dictated by laws and powers far higher than all that the boasted omnipotence of Parliament can exercise? It is a very grievous process. I would to God we could arrest it; but we shall only make matters worse if we resist it, in spite of the teachings of experience and the knowledge of political economy that we possess. Depend upon it, there is no prospect of relief to the labouring man in Mr. Chamberlain's proposal; there is only the prospect of a most ingenious, most carefully-thought-out scheme of political domination and corruption, to which, if you retain any of the instincts of free men, you will offer a firm and unwavering resistance.

On the subject of free education, Lord Salisbury has "the singular and unusual felicity of being very much of the same point of view as Mr. Gladstone."

I think that this question cannot be dealt with in the summary way in which Mr. Chamberlain has dealt with it. I have no doubt whatever that the effect of the compulsory character of education does give to the poorer classes of the community a considerable claim. But they are assisted under the present law, though I do not think that the law is liberal enough. I should like to make it more liberal; but I do not see—because I think it reasonable that those who are in very poor circumstances, and to whom a portion of the fee is remitted—that we should therefore make a present of large sums of public money to a great number of people who are perfectly competent to pay for the education of their own children. I cannot help seeing in this proposal—as, indeed, Mr. Morley has clearly indicated—a desire to get rid of that which we cherish as one of our most important privileges—the right of religious education. I do claim that to whatever Church or sect of Christianity they belong, there should be the utmost opportunity given to educate the people in that belief of Christianity, instead of driving them away to the lifeless, boiled-down, mechanical, unreal religious teaching which is prevalent in Board schools.

Referring to the sale of glebe lands Lord Salisbury said:—

There is one change I should like to advocate, and which would place a great deal of land in the market, though I have my doubts as to who the purchasers of the land would be. I have observed during these years of depression that the position of clergymen who possess glebe land, and the position of charitable foundations dependent upon the same bequests of land, is pitiable in the extreme. I have known men enjoying good incomes in the good times quite suddenly reduced to poverty. Just consider the position of the clergyman who is left with a lot of land on his hands. He can raise no capital to work it. As a clergyman he can give no time to attend to it, for his time is fully occupied. No farmer will take the land. He is absolutely without resource, and the large income which he enjoyed the day before has vanished like a dream. His case is bad enough; but what is the case of those small charitable foundations which you will find right through the country and upon which many orphans and widows are dependent? The land is thrown upon their hands, and the farmer will deal with it no longer. They cannot obtain capital, and it is a white elephant, which brings them nothing but ruin. I would like to see facilities placed in the hands of all clergymen and all ecclesiastical and charitable corporations to sell—always at a fair price and by a free contract—the land upon which their incomes depend. They would be much better off and much happier if their incomes were derived from Consols. I do not wish to apply any sort of compulsion to them. At present their liberty is retained by a certain terrible central office which exists in London, known as the Ecclesiastical Commission. I have had some dealings with it, and I avow that no consideration whatever should induce me to have any more. I do not accuse them of any moral evil; it is the perfection of moral integrity. It is so spotless that they take every conceivable precaution that imagination can suggest to protect it, and they are so minute and so careful that it is impossible that any imperfection can find its way through the meshes they spread before it. I wish to get rid of the Ecclesiastical Commission. I would like to see every clergyman, or the trustees of every charitable society, have the right to sell their land and invest the proceeds in Consols, and, except in cases of manifest fraud, nobody should have the right to annul that transaction. You would then bring into market a quantity of land all over the country peculiarly suited for gardens and allotments if such were desired, and which, if there exists this class of agricultural labourers who desire to become small farmers, would precisely suit their demands—land which in its present position would be better placed in the hands of any private owner, no matter to what class he belonged.

In conclusion, Lord Salisbury said he could have wished that Mr. Gladstone's sacrifice of the Church upon the altar of party—this crowning abandonment of the convictions of his youth—had been spared to us.

It means that the time of ultimate and supreme conflict is at hand. The language that Mr. Chamberlain has used, the fact that he has used it without rebuke, the fact that he is being allowed to assume the position of leader of the Liberal party almost without hindrance and almost without demur—these things now show that even in the next Parliament you may have a proposal for the disestablishment of the churches of this country—a proposal more fraught with frightful disaster to us as a nation, more fraught with calamitous events than anything in legislation that has taken place since Parliamentary government was founded. The Church will be stripped and bare, and in every part of the land the machinery by which God's word has been preached, by which Christianity has been upheld, by which the sick have been visited and comforted, by which all the ministrations of religion have been carried to suffering humanity in its various stages of need—all this machinery will be by one blow destroyed, and generations will be required before it could be replaced. This it is which with a light heart Mr. Gladstone is prepared to sacrifice. We can only accept his announcement as a call to greater energy and preparation on our own part.

"There are Liberal Churchmen," continued Lord Salisbury, "whose action, I confess, in this great crisis, astounds me."

To those Liberal Churchmen who think that the interests of the Church are the dearest matter upon the whole field of political controversy with which they could have to do—to them I appeal to consider as to the course which they shall pursue now that it is announced in no obscure accents that their leader is prepared to desert them on the first convenient opportunity. Liberal Churchmen who now support the Liberal party are sharpening the weapons by which the Church is to be struck down. I cannot conceive what the sophistry is that induces them at such a time to join their hands, to join their feet, to join their efforts with those who are ready to undertake the destruction of the mechanism by which Christianity has been upheld in this country. At all events, we can hold no ambiguous language on this matter. To us it is a matter of life and death. Our party is bound up with the maintenance of the Established and Endowed Churches of these islands. The maintenance of the framework of our Constitution, the upholding of the rights of property, and, more than all, the support of the sacred institution—its support by ancient endowments, and by the recognition of the authority of the State — which now for generation after generation, in Scotland and in England, has held up the power of truth and has maintained the truths of Christianity before the world, to that as a party, as honest men, and as Christians, we are irrevocably bound.

Ecclesiastical.

PREFERMENTS AND APPOINTMENTS.

Rev. J. P. Benson, Curate of Holy Trinity, Gainsborough, to Rectory of Clee-cum-Cleethorpes. Patron, the Bishop of Lincoln.

Rev. F. N. Carus-Wilson, to Vicarage of Nonington, Kent. Patron, the Archbishop of Canterbury.

Rev. R. D. L. Clarke, to Vicarage of Desborough. Patron, Mr. W. C. C. Thornhill.

Rev. E. V. Collins, to Vicarage of Caldicott, near Chepstow.

Rev. R. R. Dolling, to be Curate-in-Charge of the Winchester College Mission, Landport, Portsmouth.

Rev. W. Evans, Curate of Llanbadarnfawr, to be Perpetual Curate of Llangorwen. Patron, Mr. G. G. Williams, Wallog, Cardiganshire.

Rev. W. K. Frith, to Vicarage of Lyddington-cum-Caldecote, Rutland. Patron, the Bishop of Peterborough.

Rev. Canon F. B. Guy, to be Acting Chaplain of the 1st Volunteer Battalion the Essex Regiment.

Rev. C. Hankey, Curate-in-Charge, to be Incumbent of St. Saviour's, Folkestone.

Rev. R. Hill, Hon. Chaplain to the Marquis of Lothian, to Rectory of Eversholt, Melbury Bubb, and Frome St. Quentin. Patron, the Earl of Ilchester.

Rev. A. T. Hodgson, to Rectory of Coston-with-Runnall, Norfolk. Patron, the Earl of Kimberley.

Rev. H. Hughes, Curate of Llywel, to be Perpetual Curate of Llanfihangel, Rhosycorn. Patron, the Bishop of St. David's.

Rev. A. B. James, to Rectory of St. Peter's, Thetford, Norfolk. Patron, the Rev. Alfred Marshall, of Burnham Overy.

Rev. H. P. James, to Rectory of Tibberton. Patron, the Rector of Edgmond.

Rev. W. Leeming, to Rectory of Withcote, Leicestershire. Patron, Mr. F. Palmer.

Rev. E. L. Lloyd, to Vicarage of Dylife. Patron, the Lord Chancellor.

Rev. H. M. Mansfield, Vicar of Bourn, to be Rural Dean of Aveland. Patron, the Bishop of Lincoln.

Rev. W. M. Ramsay, to Rectory of Wyfordby, Leicestershire. Patron, Mr. D. Thwaites.

Rev. S. G. Read, Rector of Barton St. Mary and All Saints' in Barton Bendish, Norfolk, to Rectory of Barton St Andrew. Patron, the Queen. (An Order in Council having lately been obtained for the union of the above named benefices.)

Rev. C. O. L. Riley, Senior Curate of Lancaster Parish Church, to Vicarage of St. Paul's, Preston.

Rev. A. D. Robinson, Vicar of St. Clement's and St. Helen's, Kensington, to be Chaplain to the Worshipful Company of Glass-sellers.

Rev. R. T. Shea, to Vicarage of Little Wakering, Essex. Patrons, the Governors of St. Bartholomew's Hospital.

Rev. A. H. Smith, Vicar of St. Peter's, Tunbridge Wells, to Rectory of St. James's, Dover. Patron, the Archbishop of Canterbury.

Rev. A. F. Sutton, to Rectory of West Tofts, Norfolk. Patron, Mrs. Charlotte Robina Sutton, of West Tofts.

Rev. F. H. Sutton, to Rectory of Brant Broughton, Lincoln. Patron, Sir Richard Francis Sutton, Bart.

Rev. W. J. Wilby, to be Chaplain and Naval Instructor to the *Active*.

Rev. E. Gough de Salis Wood, to Vicarage of St. Clement's, Cambridge. Patron, the Archbishop of Canterbury.

LICENCE TO CURACY BY THE BISHOP OF CHESTER.—Rev. William Fielding, B.A., to Aston.

LICENCES TO CURACIES BY THE BISHOP OF PETERBOROUGH.—Revs. Robert Greeley Douglas, B.A., to St. Matthew's, Leicester; Charles Mansell, to Lamport-cum-Faxton; F. Whitehead, to Kingsthorpe.

LICENCES TO CURACIES BY THE BISHOP OF ROCHESTER.—Revs. Alfred Ernest Foster, to Holy Trinity, Tulse-hill; Frederick James Shaw, to St. Paul's, Greenwich.

LICENCE TO CURACY BY THE BISHOP OF ST. DAVID'S.—Rev. John Davies, to Llanllwch.

LICENCES TO CURACIES BY THE HON. AND REV. CANON GORDON, DURING THE VACANCY OF THE SEE OF SALISBURY.—Revs. John Moxey Easterling, to Stubbridge; Dudley Brice Montefiore, B.A., to Lyme Regis.

OBITUARY.

July 31, at Parramatta, the Rev. F. W. Stretton, Incumbent of St. Matthew's, Windsor, N.S.W., Rural Dean, aged 39.

Sept. 24, at Bideford, the Rev. William Watkins, M.A., formerly Warden of the College, Llandovery, aged 43.

Sept. 29, at Bramdean House, Hants, the Rev. A. C. Bishop, M.A., Rector of Bramdean, and formerly Rector of Martyr Worthy, in the same county.

Sept. 30, at Sprowston, the Rev. Henry Banfather, B.D., Rector of Beeston St. Andrew, aged 92.

Sept. 30, at Wincanton, Richard Nicholson, Rector of Wincanton, Somerset, and late Rector of Beachingstoke, Wilts, aged 58.

Oct. 1, at Milan, the Rev. James Matthew Roberton, M.A., for twenty-five years Vicar of St. Botolph, Aldgate, and Wednesday Evening Lecturer at St. Olave's, Jewry, aged 60.

Oct. 2, the Rev. Robert Louis Cloquet, Rector of Covenham St. Bartholomew, Louth, and Chaplain of the Pelham Pillar Lodge of Freemasons, No. 792, and formerly Curate-in-Charge of St. Luke's, Great Grimsby.

Oct. 4, at Belton Vicarage, the Rev. Joseph Empson Middleton, Vicar of Belton, and for twenty-six years Lecturer and Tutor at St. Bees College, Cumberland, aged 78.

Oct. 5, at Hyères, Var, France, the Rev. Alfred Headlam, aged 37.

MISCELLANEOUS CHURCH INTELLIGENCE

The Bishop of Southwell has just opened a new church at Derby, built at a cost of £5,000. Three new churches have been erected in that town within the last four years.

The consecration of Dr. Wordsworth, the new Bishop of Salisbury, is fixed to take place in Westminster Abbey on the 28th inst. It is interesting to note that on the same day of 1869 Archbishop Tait, the late Primate, consecrated Dr. Moberly as Bishop of Salisbury in the Abbey.

The Bishop of Chester has appointed the Rev. Dr. Critchley, head master of Chester Training College, to the living of Long Newton, near Stockton, value £560 per annum.

The Archbishop of York has so re-arranged the parishes in that city that five churches will, it is stated, be no longer required. There is some outcry in the district against the removal of these buildings, coming mainly from archæologists.

The restoration of the chancel of the parish church of St. Mary, Little Stonham, Suffolk, has just been commenced. The cost of the improvement will be about £350.

The parish church of St. Michael, Bishop Stortford, has just been reopened after considerable alterations in the chancel. The cost was originally estimated at £1,575, but it is now expected that it will exceed that sum.

The Rev. Canon Wheeler writes as follows from Wolford Vicarage, Shipston-on-Stour:—"In the next parish to my own, having a population of over 700, there is a beautiful church, and there are three Dissenting chapels. At present there is a good Church feeling, and the services are well attended. The living has just become vacant, by the vicar's obtaining other preferment. Owing to circumstances which it would take too long to detail here, but chiefly owing to agricultural depression, the living, nominally worth £178 net, produces only the odd £8. It has been known for several months that it was about to become vacant. The patrons, unable to find any clergyman to accept it, placed it in the hands of the Bishop. The Bishop, equally unable, placed it in mine. I too have failed, and it is now sequestrated to the churchwardens. They have been with me, and assure me that they have only £8 a year, and that not in hand, to provide for the services of the church, adding that Dissent will become rampant if these are discontinued. Will any of your readers assist me to raise a small fund to provide temporarily for the services of the Church in this unfortunate parish, until some permanent remedy can be found?"

The foundation of a new church, to be built at the expense of Mr. and Mrs. H. Williams, of Moor Park, Harrogate, has just been laid. The edifice is to be dedicated to St. Michael, and the donors have also decided to endow the church.

The Dean of St. Asaph has tendered to the Bishop his resignation of the office of Chancellor of the diocese, which he has held for twenty-six years. The step has been induced by the Venerable Dean's advanced age, and also by his not having fully recovered from the effects of a carriage accident which he recently sustained.

The Rev. S. L. Norman, vicar of Burn Moor, has received the appointment of Hon. Canon of Durham, vacant by the death of the Rev. Canon Eden.

On Monday evening two large meetings were held in Portsmouth, which, though having no distinct connection with the Congress itself, had yet been aptly appointed in the Congress week and in the town chosen for its meeting. The Winchester Diocesan branch of the Temperance Society held their meeting in the Congress Hall, under the presidency of the Bishop of Newcastle, and there was a large attendance of members of the Congress and others. The chairman, in his opening remarks, after speaking of the great progress which the society had made in its work, and of the manner in which it had risen from small beginnings, in spite of the coldness with which its early efforts were received, to its present position of one of the recognised agencies of the Church, said that much still remained to be done. The society had received great encouragement, not only in the diocese of Winchester but throughout England; but they must not be indolent. Especially must they enlist the young in the cause of temperance, for their struggle was both against a tendency of human nature, which, unhappily, was always led more easily in the direction of its animal than of its spiritual instincts, and also against a great trade and a great trade organization. "Moral suasion" was not sufficient for their purpose; there must also be legislative effort, and all their efforts to be successful must find an echo in the minds of the people themselves. The Bishop, who was frequently cheered in the course of his speech, was followed by Prebendary Grier, Mr. C. E. Tritton, Colonel Twynam, and Canon Ellison, founder of the Church Temperance Society.

A still larger audience assembled in Ginnett's Circus, at the meeting of the Free and Open Church meeting, which was addressed by Mr. L. W. Ford, Mr. F. W. Buxton, M.P., the Rev. R. D. Stoney, Mr. Richard Foster, and others. The following resolutions were put *en bloc* to the meeting and unanimously carried:—"1. That all parishioners, without respect to class, have an equal right to the free use of their parish churches, and that the pew system, under which seats are permanently appropriated to individuals to the exclusion of the many, is opposed alike to scriptural precept, to the law of the Church, and to the spiritual requirements of the people. 2. That every church should be open and free of access to all at all times as a house of prayer, especially for the use of those living in crowded neighbourhoods who have little opportunity for privacy in their own homes. 3. That the weekly offertory especially enjoined by the Church in accordance with scriptural injunctions is the most fitting means of providing for the expenses of Divine worship and for other 'pious and charitable uses,' inasmuch as it enables everyone to give according to his means as 'an offering unto the Lord,' instead of limiting the contributions to fixed payments by the few for the enjoyment of exclusive privileges."

THE CHURCH CONGRESS.

(*Continued from page* 655.)

LECTURE HALL.—THURSDAY.

In the morning

THE CHURCH AND THE PRINTING PRESS

was the subject of discussion.

Mr. A. H. HALLAM MURRAY read the first paper. The Church and the Press, he said, must always act and react on one another for good. It was a question whether the press did not occasionally abuse its privileges and carry its censure of the Church beyond legitimate propriety, but at the same time it was only just to acknowledge that much good was done by the just criticism of the Press. There were in existence at the present time both Church and Dissenting periodicals of various kinds, but the great desideratum seemed to him to be a distinctly Church press free from party bias. Considering, however, the heterogeneous class it would have to cater for, it must not bear on its face the stamp of the Church, as that would probably ruin it at the outset, as the working man was certainly opposed to despotism. Of most of the existing Sunday newspapers he could not speak highly, as they tended to pander to the worst tastes of the people. Many attempts had been made to establish a suitable Church paper, but without success, the reason of their failure being want of funds and inadequate support at the outset; but he took it that the true reason why the poor man's Church paper had not been supported was because the clergy had never found one worth supporting. He contended that it was the duty of the Church to establish and support a suitable Church paper, and with energy and perseverance this could be accomplished.

The Rev. E. MACLURE dealt with the book and magazine literature of the Church. If they had a daily Church paper it should be without politics, but what was really needed was literature which would supplant the pernicious novels of the day.

The Rev. Charles Bullock, Mr. T. Clisham, the Rev. G. N. Godwin, Mr. William Storr, of London, the Rev. J. Wycliffe Gedge, the Rev. Henry Roe, and others took part in the discussion.

At the afternoon meeting the subject under discussion was

CLERGY PENSIONS,

the first paper being read by Canon BLACKLEY, Stockbridge, as follows:—

The subject of Clergy Pensions has, as most of my hearers are aware, become one of very prominent clerical interest within the last few years. Various meetings were held for its discussion at different times and places, and in January last, a conference, presided over by Archdeacon Hessey, appointed a committee of twenty-four members, consisting of such clergy and laymen as seemed to have taken the most earnest part in the study of the question, to draw up a report on the best means of establishing a Clergy Pensions Fund. After holding several meetings that committee appointed a sub-committee, to embody their resolutions in a report, which, when drawn up, was agreed to by twenty-two out of twenty-four members, and, when presented to the adjourned conference, held at the National Society's House, on June 16th last, was unanimously adopted. The sub-committee were also requested to continue their labours, to make such alterations and additions to the report as might be found necessary by them, and to take such steps as might be desirable for its circulation at the earliest period.

It is in pursuance of this unanimous resolution that, feeling that no better means could be imagined for circulating the proposals of the new and needed clergy pensions scheme amongst the clergy of our Church, whom it most of all concerns, our committee applied for and obtained from the Subjects Committee of the Church Congress the opportunity, which we most thankfully acknowledge, of bringing this subject before the meeting of to-day.

As its objects and methods will be set before you by specially qualified readers and speakers who will follow me, I shall limit myself to the consideration of a few points in the proposals most likely to be objected to by persons who have not studied the question in all its aspects.

I. Some persons object to our proposals as not sufficiently comprehensive. "Why a pension fund only," they say, "and not an endowment fund for widows and orphans as well?" The answer is: We must walk before we can run. We *can* see our way at present to providing pensions for the clergy themselves. This is easily calculable; it depends on no conditions of health. If an unhealthy man contracts for a deferred annuity the fund benefits in security by his shorter life. But annuities for widows and children, receivable over many years of probably robust life and becoming claimable all the earlier if the husband and father die before the average date, would simply add an almost incalculable cost to the estimate of any fund to be established.

II. Again, some people say, Why not advocate a compulsory pension, obliging every man in orders to secure one for himself? This view is strongly held

by a few of our clerical brethren, and even, as I think you will hear by-and-bye, by one or two of our own committee. It might be sufficient to say, within my short twenty minutes, that our committee, consisting more or less of experts, after debate in which all the arguments in favour of compulsion were thrashed out as ably, and at far greater length than they can be here to-day, decided by more than ten to one against the practicability of any present compulsion in the matter; I might point out that no advocate of compulsion has yet ventured to put forward one single practical suggestion as to how it might conceivably be enforced on all the clergy; or, I might appeal to my own known opinions in favour of compulsory self-provision against pauperism, as proving my objection to compulsory clerical pension provision to be due to no fantastic theories in favour of the liberty of bad subjects to live on the earnings of good ones, or to no crotcheteering wish to trim the fading lamp of foolish *laissez-faire;* but, as this question of compulsion seems to be the only one at all likely to impede the progress and the utility of the carefully thought out, soundly based, much needed, and the very hopeful scheme which will be explained to you by its elaborator, Mr. Duncan, I will press one point only of the matter as forcibly as I can upon the attention of my hearers. It is this: To do nothing till a fair and practicable way is known of compelling all clergy to make pension provision is simply to leave matters as they are indefinitely; while to establish a good voluntary system at once would bring the possibility of a compulsory one nearer to acceptance than a century of preliminary talk could do. Our voluntary scheme appeals so strongly to the general interest and common sense, as to make the majority of the clergy join it for their own sakes; and its success with the great majority would give the strongest argument conceivable for its being hereafter made compulsory on the small minority. Moreover, whether that argument were used or no, we should be doing good instead of doing nothing. In a word, are all the anxious men who long to secure a pension to be condemned to do without it till all who do not need it or desire it are compelled to pay their contributions? Are all the guests at a picnic to do without dinner because one has brought no basket, or are the many to starve because the few are not hungry?

Compulsion by an *ad valorem* tax on livings would simply require most men who had made their own provisions already pay for all who had neglected that duty. This would be a communistic re-enactment, for the special demoralisation of the clergy, of a Poor Law, which would, like its great national namesake, create more pauperism than it could relieve. This is a theoretical objection; and a practical one lies in the fact, that existing clerical incomes are too small to provide, by any possibility, sufficient retiring funds for all existing clergy.

This assertion leads me to illustrate briefly the reason why, to effect the desired object promptly, instead of waiting forty or fifty years for the present generation of unprovided clergy to die out, a good claim can be urged upon Church laity, for the Church's own good, to help out the clergy pensions measure in its first inception.

It is because the clerical profession is wrongly supposed to be a wealthy one, while, as a matter of fact, there is no profession of educated men nearly so badly remunerated as our own. A very common cry on this subject is, that the Church is very rich, while some only of the clergy are very poor. In other words, that a fairer division of Church property would remedy all the financial shortcomings of the profession. That the average gross income of the clergy from their benefices is under £250 a year justifies the assumption in round numbers that their average net income does not exceed £200, and I call the attention of my hearers to the following comparisons with other callings in life. Take the legal profession. The barristers and solicitors in England number together only 17,000, while the clergy of the Church of England number 21,000. We will set the Chancellorship and the thirty-three Judgeships for this much smaller number against the thirty-one Bishoprics receiving a far lower general income, and will also set the County Court Judgeships, many though they be, and each worth £1,500 a year net, against our thirty Deaneries, one of whose worthiest occupants is present at this Congress and receiving *nothing* a year, while liable for his predecessor's retiring pension.

Eliminating, then, all these so-called great prizes of the two professions, I find from *Whitaker's Almanac*, that, exclusive of numberless commissionerships, and other posts in Government offices only tenable by barristers, there are in the law offices, registries, and police-courts of London alone, 130 appointments over £1,000 a year and averaging £2,340, while the Archbishop, and Bishops among them can dispose of less than fifty livings over £1,000, and averaging one half the average value of the London law appointments. Again, I look through all these appointments to find any law officials whatever receiving so microscopical a net salary as £200, the average net income of all the clergy, and find only four individuals in that dismal category, of whom three are junior clerks, and the solemn and important duty of the fourth is as train-bearer, to hold up the tail of the Lord Chancellor's robe.

Take the Army and Navy again; without desiring to begrudge due honour to merit, we must note that successful Generals and Admirals, besides the promotions, titles, and other glories they receive, are often gifted with large sums of money, £20,000, £30,000, or £100,000 beyond their pay or stipulated pension by their grateful country. But who has ever heard an instance of the grateful race of Englishmen presenting a meritorious clergyman, for a whole life spent in the truest service of his country, with 20,000 halfpence, however liberally they bestow upon him the proverbial uncivil substitute for such copper coin?

Lastly, apply the average earnings of clerical workers to those of persons in less easily compared pursuits of life. Take the bankers, the merchants, the stock-brokers; how many of them would be toiling till old age in their avocations if the average income obtainable by all their work from twenty-five years of age till seventy was strictly limited to so small a sum as £200 a year?

Let it be remembered that I press these striking contrasts, not in the interests of the clergy who want pensions, but of the Church which wants resignations of aged incumbents, as the only conceivable means of quickening promotions of the younger and more active men, and making our Church more effective than ever.

III. But here, again, objection may be taken to our scheme on the wrong assumption of its appearing to be of an eleemosynary nature. We answer, firstly, that any one who chooses may make his provision by its means in *an entirely independent manner.* He will not be bound to receive the large accretions derived from well-wishers to the Church and her work, and his abstention will make matters better for those who, feeling that the labourer is worthy of his hire, and that the hire is specially precarious for present aged labourers, may only too thankfully receive the aid of Churchmen offered to meet their own efforts. Therefore there is no necessary eleemosynary character in our proposal. But if it be argued that no clergyman should receive any aid whatever, we reply that such a statement implies a fallacy—namely, that the present incomes of all the clergy are sufficient not only to provide for their present existence, but for their future pensions. It is perfectly obvious that, whatever young men may do in a proper spirit of independence, it is too late for the older ones to pay for their own pensions entirely. And, therefore, we can honestly plead for help to them; and, by this means, for an earlier quickening of resignation in the true interests of the Church. For there is no greater mistake than to imagine the clergy generally to be wealthy men—an error which only arises from the greater systematic self-denial in almsgiving and charities which their holy profession teaches them, and which leads the ignorant to suppose that, because they give more away than average laymen, they must have a larger stock to draw on for their gifts.

In fact, if we ask Churchmen generally to help this scheme by benefactions, it is, as you will shortly hear from others, chiefly to remove existing and otherwise insurmountable difficulties. If our Church sees and does its duty, it may practically endow its workers with more or less security in old age; but its aid, first given to those most needing it, will only come last in time and least in measure to those who are able to aid themselves to-day; and when those now more aged are passed away, a less and less amount of extraneous aid will be required to secure the resignation in good time of those to whom this beneficial machinery will have given an opportunity of secure independent provision—an opportunity which never was within the most distant reach or fondest hope of many a worthy labourer in the Lord's vineyard who is old and poor to-day.

Whatever, therefore, can be called eleemosynary in this scheme is only of a temporary nature, and, moreover, can fairly be claimed from Churchmen, who have never provided any endowments for Church purposes, not as a dole to improve the position of needy clergy, but as a duty to aid the efficiency of the Church of Christ itself, by, so to speak, setting free her existing resources from the otherwise irremovable burden of supporting worn-out men.

Passing from the question of providing for men now too far advanced in life to secure retiring pensions from their own resources, I earnestly desire, in conclusion, to call the attention of my younger brethren to one most salient point of our proposals. The Clergy Pensions Institution offers this unique and otherwise unattainable advantage to a newly ordained man. By paying £2 2s. a year from the age of 25, he may secure an annuity of £25 a year on attaining 65 years, whether he retire from work or not.

If he then retire from work, he will have added to his annuity, his share of all accretions to the fund as endowments by all Churchmen, from now till then, who use the organisation of the Clergy Pensions Institution for the deposit and accumulation of such retirement funds for the clergy as all members of our Church ought to contribute, not by way of alms to individual clergy, but by way of aid to the efficiency of the Church itself. There is good reason to hope that, by the time present ordinees are able to claim that share, their £2 2s. a year will secure them £100 pension at least.

In addition to this they may also secure, on independent terms, by paying a second sum of £1 13s. 4d. a year, a retiring pension of £100 a year at 60. So that, by paying from ordination £3 13s. 6d. a year, a clergyman retiring at 60 years of age, could claim a pension of £100 a year, which at 65 years of age *must* amount to £125, but will, in all human probability, reach £200 a year.

It is perfectly obvious that, as regards the men never beneficed at all, such a provision will prove an immense boon, giving them in their advanced life, an average secure provision greater than they ever earned, and extinguishing for them the risk of penury and want. On the other hand, to men possessed of benefices, a pension of £200 a year, with whatever additional sum might be assigned them on retirement, would secure at least the average income earned by beneficed men, and induce the retirement in good time exactly of the class whose inefficiency, through advancing age, is of most injury to the interests of the congregations. Moreover, the grand effect of such a system, if generally adopted, would be to remedy one of the greatest existing disadvantages of the clerical profession—namely, the slowness of promotion to independent posts in the Church. For the Pensions Institution would so stimulate earlier resignations as to reduce the thirteen years, now the average period between ordination and obtaining a benefice, to something less than seven.

But, desirable though these objects may be, we are, of course, met at once by the common exclamation, "Many candidates for orders are too poor to undertake such a cost as this; they find it hard enough to live on their stipends."

I should have thought no new ordinee would have offered such a plea on his own behalf had the case not happened once in a conference which I attended, and where, the possibility of any small payment at all being disputed, a young curate present, being appealed to, said that for his part (and he was receiving £150 a year) it would be absolutely impossible for him to find any money for the purpose!

Of course, there is one obvious answer to this objection; if young men in their earliest and easiest time are unwilling to do anything whatever for self-provision, they deserve no help and no pity when they grow old; and if that were at all the general spirit of the English clergyman, who undertakes to inculcate fulfilment of duty on all men, the establishment of a Clergy Pensions Fund would be a folly, and its advocacy on a Church Congress platform a simple impertinence.

But I am bold to absolutely deny that there is any impossibility whatever in such small contributions; it is altogether a matter of management, not of possibility. Suppose that curate's stipend fell to-morrow by two per cent., would he starve? Most certainly not. And, therefore, as there are such inexperienced young men to be found, and as their inexperience should not deprive wiser ones of the vast advantage which the establishment of a sound and cheap pension fund will secure, the proper course to do is to give some suggestions for making the management of such contributions more easy than at first may seem.

Therefore, we should ask the societies which contribute so largely to the stipends of curates to consider whether they might not greatly aid so good a cause by stipulating, either with the curate or incumbent, that, say 2 per cent. of each grant they made should be lodged with the Pensions Institution to the credit of each curate's pension account; we should ask the clergy who nominate candidates to make the same stipulation; we might even ask the Bishops, without making any such contributions a *sine qua non* to ordination, to put a question on their ordination papers which would ascertain the mind of the young men desirous of entering their dioceses as to the general duty, in their own interests and in the interests of the Church, to provide for pensions for themselves, just as a means of being able to provide for "their own" afterwards, as St. Paul commanded us all to do. And I am encouraged to hope that if the general body of Churchmen do its duty in this matter, by example and by counsel, there will ere long be established such a general conviction of the advantage of joining, and of the unworthiness of remaining outside of such a society, that the Clergy Pensions Fund, like its great and beneficent forerunner, the Clergy Mutual Assurance Society, will be found to have lightened, not only the burden of advancing age to the clergy, but also the graver burden of increasing inefficiency to the Church.

The Rev. C. J. Robinson said the necessity of providing for the retirement of the clergy whom age or infirmity had disabled was a necessity of modern growth. He looked to the retirement of the older clergy as the most hopeful means for accelerating promotion among the younger. The Church of England virtually made no provision whatever for her aged and disabled ministers. If at the usual age of ordination, or soon afterwards, a clergyman subscribed his two guineas a-year to the Clergy Pensions Institution, he would receive at 65 an annuity of £25, or a proportionately less sum if compelled to claim it at an earlier date. What was wanted in a great movement such as this ought to be was united action upon the part of the clergy and laity. If that were given its success was assured.

Mr. John Duncan, Fellow of the Institute of Actuaries, explained the scheme of the Clergy Pensions Institution, and pointed out that its ultimate aim was to provide on a business footing for all the material necessities of the clergy, apart from those of their working years, to which their stipends applied. Other speakers followed.

The Lecture Hall in the evening was given up to a meeting for soldiers and sailors, which was addressed by Earl Nelson, the Bishop of Newcastle, the Dean of York, the Rev. J. Welldon, and the Rev. Pelham Stokes, who said:—

It is the duty of the leaders of men to be cheerful. We have much to ought to fill our hearts with gladness. We are thankful that our soldiers and sailors are so dear to the heart of our Queen. We are thankful that so deep an interest in the Army and Navy is taken by their Royal Highnesses the Commander-in-Chief, the Duke of Edinburgh, who is every inch a sailor, and the Duke of Connaught, who is every inch a soldier. We are thankful that God has raised up such self-denying and noble-hearted women as Miss Robinson, Miss Daniell, and Miss Agnes Weston, to work amongst you. Now we are not here to tell you what soldiers and sailors ought to be like. You know a great deal better than we do. As a clergyman, I hope I may do my duty half as well as you do yours. We meet to lay before you the three great principles on which all true members of the Church of England are supposed to live. The *first* is submission to the Divine Head of the Church, the Lord Jesus Christ, the "Captain of our Salvation." Entire submission, at all costs and risks, is the very essence of a soldier's life. During the Franco-German War great efforts were made to send the Gospel to each army. Among a number of God-fearing Evangelists was one who was despatched to the city of Metz. There was the flower and pride of the French army. He preached daily, and it was the means of doing a great deal of good. On the eve of the great sortie he had been preaching and urging his listeners to repent. Before they separated they sang that beautiful hymn, "Just as I am, without one plea," and looking amongst his audience he saw a young officer with tears streaming down his face. He endeavoured to get to him, but the dispersion of the crowd prevented him finding him. The next morning all the pride and chivalry of France went out of the city. Many were at the gate to watch them depart, and amongst those was the Evangelist, who had stationed himself there in the hope of having the opportunity of saying a word to this young officer. The soldiers marched out, regiment after regiment, and at last, riding at the head of one detachment, was the young officer. The Evangelist forced his way up to him, and laying his hand on the officer's arm, said, "Is it well with thee?" The officer looked at him, and with a smile irradiating his countenance had only time just time to utter the words, "Just as I am, without one plea." On the evening of that day that young officer was lying cold and dead upon the battle-field, but his spirit was gone to his Father in heaven. Such is the way you must come to Christ; forsake your evil ways, come to the foot of the Cross, cast down your burden of sin and guilt and say:—

> "Just as I am, without one plea,
> But that Thy blood was shed for me,
> And that Thou bidd'st me come to Thee,
> O Lamb of God, I come!"

This is submission. Yielding yourself thus to Christ is the very essence of a Christian's life, and the result of obeying this call is pardon and safety. At Portland there is a harbour of refuge, where our ships lie in safety, while the waves are running mountains high on the well-known Chesil beach—a beautiful analogy of the soul, which has become possessed of the pardon and safety so freely offered to us by Jesus Christ. The *second* principle is sacrifice. All of you know something about this, called upon as you are to leave your homes for the honour of your Queen and country. But the highest of all sacrifices is that of yourselves to one another. We cannot be too often reminded of the brave, self-denying General Gordon, the man who delivered an empire, and stood at bay for a year, alone, against failing hope and coming death, for the sake of others, and who, when in command at Gravesend, brought the ragged little street boys into his own house and trained them up for God. There was sacrifice! We say to you, "Take Gordon as your model;" but, above all, take his Master as your pattern; copy His beautiful life, and live solely for His glory and your comrades' sake. I cannot impress this principle upon you in better words than those of the Gospel, "Whatsoever ye would that men should do unto you, do ye even so to them," and you will seldom do it without sacrificing yourself. And the *third* principle is service. It means a great deal when we say, "We have been, or are in the service;" but it means a great deal more when we can say, "We are in Christ's service, fighting manfully under His banner, against sin, the world, and the devil; and endeavouring to continue Christ's faithful soldiers and servants unto our life's end." We know your difficulties in serving God. Think of those forty men of the "Thundering Legion," the story of whose courage has cheered many a soldier of Christ. When the Emperor Licinius was persecuting the Christians in Armenia, the Thundering Legion was stationed at Sebaste. Forty men in that Legion declared themselves Christians, and were sentenced to be exposed all night on a frozen pool, stripped of their clothing, for it was winter and bitterly cold. In a house on the edge of the pool a large fire was kindled, and food and wine and warm baths were prepared under the charge of Sempronius, a centurion, and a guard of soldiers; and it was announced to the forty, that if any of them left the pool and entered the house they would be considered to have denied Christ. So night came on, and the keen wind from the mountains made the citizens close their windows and doors more tightly and heap up the fuel on their hearths. And on the frozen pool were the forty warriors, some standing lost in prayer, some walking quickly to and fro, some already sleeping that sleep which only ends in death. And ever and again, as the hours went slowly by, they prayed: "O Lord, forty soldiers have come forth to fight for Thee; grant that forty soldiers may receive the crown of victory." And now, as the cold grew more intense, one of the forty could endure no longer, and he left the pool and came to the house where Sempronius and his men were keeping guard. But still the martyr's prayer went up to heaven: "O God, *forty* soldiers have come forth to fight for Thee; grant that *forty* soldiers may receive the crown of victory." And the prayer was answered. Sempronius, the centurion, was touched by his comrades' bravery. He declared himself a Christian, and took his place upon the frozen pool. And when the cold had done its work, and forty corpses lay upon the ice, forty glorious spirits, with Sempronius among them, entered into the presence of their King. Surely this will encourage you to go on praying, even if others jeer, never to be turned away from the Bible-class, prayer-meeting, or Holy Communion, by what your comrades say or think. Remember the beautiful promise, "To him that overcometh will I grant to sit with Me in My throne, even as I also overcame, and am set down with My Father in His throne."

> "Who are these like stars appearing,
> These, before God's throne who stand?
> Each a golden crown is wearing,
> Who are all this glorious band?
> These are they who have contended
> For their Saviour's honour long,
> Wrestling on till life was ended,—
> Following not the sinful throng;
> These, who well the fight sustained,
> Triumph by the Lamb have gained."

The second section of the Congress met in the Wesleyan schoolroom to discuss

THE ATTITUDE OF THE CHURCH WITH RESPECT TO MOVEMENTS IN FOREIGN CHURCHES.

The Archbishop of Dublin, who presided, read a paper on the attitude of the Church with respect to movements in foreign Churches, in which he said that they welcomed all Churches reformed upon the model of the Primitive Church.

Prebendary Meyrick and the Bishop of Gibraltar also contributed papers.

The Rev. C. R. Hale, D.D., of Baltimore, United States, said that the Anglican Churches should endeavour to see how much they have in common with foreign Churches.

The Rev. Dr. Nevin, of America, insisted on the right of the Anglican Church to supply episcopal supervision to those who had been deprived of it, and the obligation surely existed where the Church of Rome withheld the Bible, used an unknown tongue, and withheld the sacraments.

CONGRESS HALL.—Friday.

The subjects discussed yesterday were, in the morning, the Spiritual Life—*a.* The Intellectual Trials of the Spiritual Life. *b.* The respective Influence of Devotion and Work in forming the Spiritual Life. *c.* The Difficulties of Private Devotion and the Aids to it. The readers and speakers being Rev. H. Footman (*a*), Rev. J. E. C. Welldon (*a*), Rev. Charles Gore (*a*), Rev. H. W. Webb-Peploe (*b*), Lord Mount-Temple (*b*), Prebendary Baker, D.D. (*b*), Canon McCormick, D.D. (*c*), Prebendary R. F. Wilson (*c*), and Canon Eliot (*c*).

In the evening "Legislative Proposals with a view to the Repression of Intemperance," was the subject of papers by Mr. E. Stafford Howard, M.P., Canon Ellison, Mr. J. G. Talbot, M.P., and Prebendary Grier.

LECTURE HALL.—Friday.

One subject only was brought forward yesterday, viz., "The Bearing of Christianity upon the Mutual Relation of the Rich and Poor—Employers and Employed," upon which Rev. Main S. A. Walrond, Mr. G. A. Spottiswoode, Rev. W. B. Richmond, and Mr. A. Froud read papers.

It has been decided that the Congress of next year is to be held at Wakefield.

At a conference held on Thursday in the Congress Hall, as to the best means of providing for the defence of the Church, resolutions were passed commending the Church Defence League, and in opposition to free Elementary schools.

*** A large number of important and interesting papers, many of which have been briefly summarised in our present issue, are in type, but are unavoidably held over.

THE COURT.

Divine service was performed in Balmoral Castle on Sunday. The Rev. Archibald Campbell officiated. Mr. W. H. Smith and the Rev. A. Campbell dined with the Queen and Royal Family. The Right Hon. W. H. Smith left the Castle.

The Prince and Princess of Wales are expected to remain on the Continent about another fortnight, in order to attend the marriage of Prince Waldemar. Their Royal Highnesses return at the close of the wedding festivities to London, and will probably be accompanied by the Queen of Denmark. The Prince of Wales, after a brief stay in the metropolis, goes, it is understood, to Newmarket for a few days, and later on with the Princess of Wales to Sandringham.

MISCELLANEOUS.

The funeral service in Westminster Abbey on Thursday over the remains of Lord Shaftesbury was attended by an immense congregation, mostly of the middle and lower classes, but including representatives of the Royal Family and Her Majesty's Government, with the Archbishop of Canterbury and other public personages. The service was partly choral, and was very impressively rendered, the Dean reading the prayers. The body of the late Earl was afterwards conveyed by train to Wimborne, and was interred at St. Giles yesterday.

The Dundee Town Council on Thursday unanimously agreed to offer the freedom of the town to the Duke of Argyll on the occasion of his visit to Dundee on the 12th of November to open the Armitstead course of lectures.

Lord Salisbury received on Thursday a deputation from Hull, who urged the repeal of that provision in the law which makes every person liable to fine and imprisonment who is on board a vessel in which contraband goods are found. The Premier said he could not suggest what form the remedy would take, but he believed that the present condition of things could not continue after the attention of Parliament was drawn to it.

The Secretary to the Marriage Law Defence Association writes:—"After fifteen months' litigation, the Supreme Appellate Court of Calcutta has, in a very lengthy judgment, just published, pronounced marriage with a deceased wife's sister, when contracted by Roman Catholics with the sanction of the Church, to be legal throughout India. The case Lopez v. Lopez, in which this decision has been given, was carried to the Appellate Court at the request of the Marriage Law Reform Association, the counsel for the appellant being Mr. Lewis Pugh, M.P. for Cardiganshire. It follows from the judgment now declared that marriage with a deceased wife's sister is legal for all classes of Her Majesty's subjects in India except European Protestants. In Ceylon there is no exception."

The School Board for London reassembled on Thursday, after a recess of over two months' duration. Mr. Buxton, the Chairman, in view of the approaching elections, made a statement as to the progress made by the present Board in comparison with the work of their predecessors. Not only, he said, had the deficiencies of the past been in the main supplied, but the principle upon which the Board were to estimate the necessities of each case had been accurately defined. The efforts which the Board had made to reduce arrears had been so far successful that the next Board would have a comparatively easy task to bring the supply of education on a level with the demand. The estimated rate for the present year was a little over 8½d. in the pound. The statement was ordered to be entered on the minutes and circulated among the members.

The Earl of Dalhousie having determined to dispose of the more outlying portions of his extensive Forfarshire estates by public roup, the first of these sales is to be held in Edinburgh during the current month, and an opportunity will be thus offered of acquiring probably some of the richest and most fertile agricultural properties in the county. The part about to be offered comprises the well-known Baronies of Redcastle and Kinnell at Inverkeillor, which comprise upwards of 4,260 imperial acres, and are divided into twenty-three farms in excellent condition, and on which large sums of money have from time to time been spent. The whole, we understand, are now let to a most industrious and high-class tenantry at moderate rents amounting to nearly £6,000 per annum. The agents, to whom the conduct of these sales have been entrusted, are the eminent London firm of Messrs. Farebrother, Ellis, Clark and Co., and the day on which the first estate will be offered is 21st October.

Property estimated to be worth £250,000 was on Thursday morning destroyed by fire in Clerkenwell. The outbreak occurred at about twenty minutes to four o'clock in the block of warehouses known as Charterhouse-buildings, and very rapidly seventeen edifices, consisting of five and six floors, became involved in the flames; but the total number of buildings which were ultimately gutted or suffered less injury is forty-six. Until about eight o'clock nearly all the available strength of the Metropolitan Fire Brigade was occupied in endeavouring to stop the course of the flames. It is understood that almost all the loss is covered by insurance.

The Commissioners of Inland Revenue have given notice to all bodies, corporate and unincorporate, that by the Revenue Act of last session they are required to pay a duty of 5 per cent. on the annual value of their real and personal property, and are bound to render returns before the 1st of December next to the secretary (corporative branch) Somerset House.

On Thursday next the first of a series of illuminated indoor evening *fêtes* on a large scale, and containing many elements of novelty, will replace at the Crystal Palace the firework displays and outdoor *fêtes* which have been so notable a feature of the summer season.

The Congregational Union of England and Wales commenced its forty-sixth autumnal meeting at Hanley on Monday, under the chairmanship of the Rev. Dr. John Thomas. On Sunday the Rev. Principal Fairbairn preached two sermons to crowded congregations in Hanley Tabernacle. The annual sermon was preached by the Rev. Dr. Joseph Parker.

The initial step in the election of a new School Board for London for the next three years took place yesterday by the nomination of a number of persons to form that body. For the purposes of this election the metropolis has hitherto been divided into ten divisions, but owing to the vast area and population of Lambeth, that district has been divided into two, east and west, so practically increasing the number of divisions to eleven. This alteration will also increase the total number of members from 55 to 58. The new Board, when formed, will be the sixth since the passing of the Elementary Education Act.

Painted windows as a memorial of departed worth and gallantry have an interest in the eyes of all. Mr. W. G. Taylor has at all times pleasure in showing his works in progress, both for church and hall, the introduction of likenesses in windows being a special study. Designs and estimates sent. Medal awarded to works in Paris Exhibition.—The "Art" Works, 4, Berners-street, London, W.

The report of the work of the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge for the 180th year (1884-1885) of its existence was on Tuesday presented to the members at their general meeting. Among the operations of the society to which particular attention was called were the provision made for the spiritual and moral welfare of emigrants; the sending out annually from the society's college (St. Katharine's) at Tottenham of a body of fifty young women, thoroughly trained for the position of mistresses in the national schools of the country; the aid given to the Bishop of Calcutta, by a grant of £5,000 to build schools for Indo-European children in his diocese, and other grants in aid of education in India; and the foundation of studentships for the training of medical missionaries for service abroad. The grants made during the year amounted to more than £47,312, a larger sum than has ever been voted by the society in one year. In making these grants the society has had to fall back upon its receipts in the form of legacies, as from various causes its receipts from annual subscriptions have not been so large this year as in previous years.

A numerous meeting of members of the Church of England Working Men's Society and others was held in the Temperance-hall, Derby, on Monday night, to consider the question of Church Defence. Sir Henry Wilmot, M.P., occupied the chair, and speeches were made by Mr. H. Byron Reed and Mr. W. H. Mason. The latter, at the conclusion of his speech, moved the following resolution:—"That this meeting desires to express its hearty approval of the efforts of this branch of the Church of England Working Men's Society to preserve the Church of England as the national religious institution of the land, and desires to express its conviction that the Disestablishment and Disendowment of the Church would be a national calamity." Mr. R. A. R. Jones seconded the motion, and on being put to the meeting it was carried by an overwhelming majority, about a dozen hands only being held up against it. Votes of thanks to the lecturers and the chairman were carried unanimously. The Derby branch of the society has received many congratulations for its bold venture on behalf of the Church.

METROPOLITAN FREE HOSPITAL.—The aggregate number of patients relieved during the week ending Sept. 26 was—medical 890 surgical 377; total 1,267, of which 493 were new cases.

MESSRS. FRY AND SONS are daily receiving numerous testimonials from the medical profession speaking in high terms of their Pure Concentrated Soluble Cocoa. Sir Charles Cameron, M.D., President of the Royal College of Surgeons, Ireland, says:—"I have formed a high opinion of its value. It is especially adapted to those whose digestive organs are weak, and I strongly recommend it as a substitute for tea." Ask your grocer for a sample of this delicious Cocoa.

CAUTION.—WATER FILTRATION.—The public are cautioned, before purchasing Filters, to see that what they buy are really water purifiers, and not mere strainers, which latter, although rendering water bright, do not remove the organic and mineral impurities. In the instructions to the local boards of health by order of the Privy Council it has been distinctly stated that the old sponge filters are of no avail for purifying water. These filters are constantly advertised as a new patent, whereas the ONLY FILTERS, containing nothing but the purest ANIMAL CHARCOAL, are those supplied by the LONDON AND GENERAL WATER-PURIFYING COMPANY (Limited), 157, Strand (four doors from Somerset House), W.C.—Read "Water: its Impurities and Purification." Price 6d

"laden with the scent of flowers,
And breath of odorous spring."

SPINNER'S TEA.—A company of merchants are now selling through Spinner & Co. the choicest teas that come from India and China in packets only. Prices 1s. 8d., 2s., 2s. 4d., and 2s. 8d. a pound. These are the perfection of teas, and will please the most fastidious.—Agents wanted in every town and village. For terms, apply to Spinner & Co., 60, Strand, London.—SPINNER & CO., London and Liverpool.

BIRTHS.

Aug. 19, at Thayetmyo, British Burmah, the wife of the Rev. JOSEPH PERRY DYER, M.A., Government Chaplain, of a daughter.

Sept. 29, the wife of the Rev. HERBERT A. GRANTHAM, Rector of Halton, Tring, of a daughter.

Sept. 29, at Lowick, Thrapstone, the wife of the Rev. C. B. BARTLETT, of a son.

Oct. 1, at 6, Hertford-terrace, Coventry, the wife of the Rev. F. H. FOWLER, of a son.

Oct. 1, at Hope Mansel Rectory, Ross, the wife of the Rev. C. A. BORRER, of a son.

Oct 2, at 17, Bedford-square, the wife of the Rev. WILLIAM PANCKRIDGE, of a son.

Oct. 4, the wife of the Rev. W. J. STRICKLAND, late Incumbent of Estcourt, Natal, of a son.

Oct. 5, at West Fordington Rectory, Dorchester, the wife of the Rev. C. H. SANCTUARY, of a daughter.

Oct. 6, at 52, Grosvenor-street, London, the Lady MARGARET M. CRICHTON-MAITLAND, of a daughter.

MARRIAGES.

Sept. 29, at St. John's Church, Eyre Court, county Galway, Colonel HUGH MCCALMONT, C.B., 7th Hussars, eldest son of the late James McCalmont, Esq., of Abbeylands, county Antrim, to Hon. ROSE ELIZABETH, youngest daughter of the late Lord CLANMORRIS.

Oct. 1, at the Baptist Chapel, Dorman's Land, East Grinstead, THOMAS, third son of JOHN BOTES, Esq., of Ford Villa, to ALICE, youngest daughter of the Rev. H. T. GRIGG, both of Dorman's Land.

Oct. 1, at St. John's Church, Sandymount, Dublin, HERBERT WILLIAM, son of RICHARD BAUGHAN ASHBY, of Forest Lodge, Leyton, to MARY, eldest daughter of the Rev. W. HEATON, of Sholebroke-avenue, Leeds.

Oct. 1, at the Church of St. John, Stratford, Essex, the Rev. ARTHUR DURRANT, son of George Frederick Durrant, Esq., of All Saints', Suffolk, to ALICE MABEL, daughter of the Rev. RAYMOND P. PELLY, Vicar of St. John's, Stratford.

Oct. 1, at the parish church, Folkestone, JOSCELINE HENEAGE WODEHOUSE, Major, Royal Artillery, eldest son of Vice-Admiral George Wodehouse, to CONSTANCE, youngest daughter of General Sir CHARLES D'AGUILAR, K.C.B.

Oct. 3, at St. Mark's Church, Notting-hill, the Rev. JAMES YOUNG BEECHER, Chaplain H.M.I.S., to EMMA MORTIMER, widow of the late Rev. WALTER APSLEY BATHURST, M.A., and youngest daughter of the late Major John Bruttou, R.M.L.I.

DEATHS.

Sept. 30, at Eastbourne, the Lady KATHERINE BANNERMAN, in her 44th year.

Oct. 1, at Tallington Vicarage, Stamford, ELLEN CHARLOTTE, wife of the Rev. FREDERICK CARROLL, aged 51.

Oct. 1, at Rampton Vicarage, Notts, after only ten days' illness, CYRIL GARDNER HOSE, son of Bishop Hose, of Singapore and Sarawak, aged nine years.

Oct. 3, at Crom Castle, the Earl of ERNE, K.P., in his 84th year.

Oct. 4, in London, on the day of his arrival from India, Colonel WILLIAM ADAM SMYTH, commanding 2nd Battalion Devon Regiment (the 11th Foot), aged 46 years.

Oct. 5, at 1, Portland-place, Great Malvern, THOMAS KENSINGTON WHISTLER, R.A., of Ashville, Leamington.

Oct. 5, at her residence, Hurst, Twyford, Berks, in her 71st year, ELIZA MCMAHON PHOTT, widow of the late Rev. Shreeve Bolry Phott, Vicar of Bramford Speke, and last surviving daughter of the late Lieutenant-General Sir Francis Wilder, K.C.B., of Binfield, Berks.

THE LIBRARY.
3d. in the 1s. Discount.
MESSRS. HATCHARD,
BOOKSELLERS to the ROYAL FAMILY,
187, PICCADILLY, LONDON.
A large and carefully-selected Stock of
ALL THE NEW AND STANDARD BOOKS
In Cloth and Leather Bindings.
CHILDREN'S PICTURE AND STORY BOOKS.
Also
BIBLES, PRAYERS, CHURCH SERVICES, &c.
Post Orders promptly executed.

TO BE PUBLISHED ON 15th OCTOBER.
Fcap. 4to, 832 pp., cloth, red edges, 10s. 6d.; or half-morocco, 15s.
A CONCISE DICTIONARY OF THE ENGLISH LANGUAGE:
LITERARY, SCIENTIFIC, ETYMOLOGICAL, AND PRONOUNCING.
Based on the New Edition of "Ogilvie's Imperial Dictionary."
By CHARLES ANNANDALE, M.A., LL.D.
*** Prospectus, with Specimen Page, post-free on application.
London: BLACKIE and SON, 49 and 50, Old Bailey.

MUDIE'S SELECT LIBRARY.
30 to 34, NEW OXFORD STREET.
281, Regent-street,; and 2, King-street, Cheapside.
NEWEST AND BEST BOOKS.
Subscription from One Guinea per Annum.
CHEAP BOOKS ON SALE.
See MUDIE'S CLEARANCE CATALOGUE for OCTOBER.

PARTRIDGE and COOPER
Stationers.
191 & 192, FLEET STREET, LONDON.
SOLE MANUFACTURERS OF
VELLUM WOVE CLUB HOUSE
Paper and Envelopes,
And ROYAL COURTS NOTE PAPER.
Samples sent Post-free, or Sample Packets of Paper and Envelopes free for 24 stamps.

GRIMSLEY'S
TERRA COTTA (STONE COLOUR)
30s. MEMORIALS.
About 4ft high, or 3ft 3in. out of ground, alike both sides, acknowledged after 25 years to be more durable than stone or iron. Artistic designs and testimonials free. HENRY GRIMSLEY, Sculptor, Chief Designer and Supervisor of Ecclesiastical Marble, Stone, and Granite Department. FREDERICK GRIMSLEY, Sculptor, Chief Designer and Supervisor of Modellers and Terra Cotta Branch. Works, Walton-street, Oxford. Address all orders, &c., Windett Woods, Oxford.

ALLEN'S PORTMANTEAUS
ALLEN'S DRESSING BAGS.
ALLEN'S DESPATCH BOXES.
ALLEN'S OVERLAND TRUNKS.
ALLEN'S BARRACK FURNITURE.
(For Officers Joining)
37, WEST STRAND, LONDON.
Cash Discount 10 Per Cent.
Illustrated Catalogues Free.

GRAND HOTEL, BRIGHTON.
AUTUMN SEASON.
The Hotel faces the South, is within easy distance of the Pier, and is well sheltered from the North and East winds. Electric Light. Exterior Fire Escapes. Passenger Lift to floors. Tariff on application to Manager.

BRITISH EMPIRE MUTUAL LIFE ASSURANCE COMPANY,
NEW BRIDGE STREET, LONDON, E.C.
Incorporated in the year 1847 under Act 7 and 8 Vict., cap. 110, and further empowered by Special Act 15 Vic., cap. 53.

Accumulated Fund	£1,028,215
Annual Income, nearly	£200,000
Profits already appropriated	£847,000
Claims paid	£1,240,133
Policies in force	£4,703,942

POLICIES ABSOLUTELY INDISPUTABLE after five years, provided the age of the Assured has been admitted.
POLICIES KEPT IN FORCE when requested by appropriating the Surrender Value to the payment of premiums.
Assurers under the TEMPERANCE SCHEME are placed in a separate Section.
Policies may be effected under the DEFERRED BONUS plan.
EDWIN BOWLEY, Secretary.

The New River.—Unquestionably the choicest Home Investment of this or any other age.—One-third of a King's Freehold share in the New River; One-eighth of an Adventurer's Freehold Share in the New River; and 12 £100 New Shares; the total income in respect of which amounted last year to £1,205.
MESSRS. EDWIN FOX and BOUSFIELD will SELL, at the Mart, on Wednesday, Oct. 28, at 2, in numerous Lots, the above valuable FREEHOLD PROPERTIES, and beg to call attention to the following specialities of the Company:
Last year's income £474,052.
Income doubled in 20 years.
Shares are freehold and confer the franchise.
Can be divided into any fractions.
Dividend over 12 per cent. per annum.
Dividend never retrograded, but annually advanced.
In 1862, £87 6s per share dividend; in 1884, £2,010 per share
The dividend is unlimited.
There have been large occasional bonuses.
The Company has large landed estates in three counties,
And house property in the City and elsewhere.
The Clerkenwell Estate occupies over 50 acres.
It is all covered with buildings let at ground rents.
The leases thereof fall in in about 20 years.
The enormous rental value will then come into possession.
The Company's income must advance as buildings increase
Rateable value of property in Company's district, £12,000,000.
It includes all the City of London,
The City of Westminster,
The Northern Parishes and Suburbs.
Water drawn chiefly from the Company's own chalk springs.
It is sufficient for the supply for all London.
The New River affords the profits of a trading corporation,
Combines the simplicity, regularity, and security of Consols,
And has the prestige of landed proprietorship.
It is especially eligible for trustees' investment,
And is suitable for investment by large or small capitalists.
Descriptive particulars may be obtained of Vendors Solicitors, Messrs Gosling and Co., 20, Spring-gardens, S.W.; of Messrs. Gabb and Walford, Abergavenny; at the Mart; and of Messrs. Edwin Fox and Bousfield, 99, Gresham-street, Bank, E.C.

Important Sale of Landed ESTATES in Scotland, Forfarshire, midway between Arbroath and Montrose, very Valuable Freehold Baronial Estates in the heart of one of the choicest districts of this favourite Residential County, and embracing some of the finest agricultural land in the kingdom.
MESSRS. FAREBROTHER, ELLIS, CLARK, and CO. will expose for SALE by PUBLIC ROUP, within Dowell's Rooms, 18, George-street, Edinburgh, on Wednesday, the 21st of October next, at two o'clock precisely, in Eleven Lots, the highly important ESTATES, comprising the Baronies of Inverkeillor and Kinnell, embracing upwards of 4,260 acres, divided into 23 superior farms, and let to a most industrious and desirous tenantry at moderate rents amounting to nearly £6,000 per annum. They have been divided into compact lots, and form most sound investments, and at the same time are eminently suitable for residential purposes.
The Redcastle portion, extending to 673 acres with sea frontage of over a mile to the celebrated Lunan Bay, occupies an elevated position, and possesses undoubted feuing value from its remarkable natural capabilities for formation into an attractive seaside resort. Attached to the estate are also the exclusive rights to the valuable salmon fisheries over 145 acres of foreshore at Lunan Bay.
For more detailed advertisements see Saturday's "Times."
29, Fleet-street, Temple Bar, and 18, Old Broad-street, London.

THE CHANCERY LANE SAFE DEPOSIT,
61 and 62, CHANCERY LANE, W.C.
This stronghold was formally opened for business by the Lord Mayor on May 7th, and the public are now invited (on presentation of card) to inspect any of the safes and strong-rooms which may remain unoccupied, when the Manager will furnish full particulars of rents, charges, &c.
The renters of safes have the use of convenient writing and waiting rooms free of charge.

PHŒNIX FIRE OFFICE,
LOMBARD ST. AND CHARING CROSS, LONDON.
Established 1782.
Insurances against Loss By Fire and Lightning effected in parts of the World.
Loss claims arranged with promptitude and liberality.
WILLIAM C. MACDONALD } Joint
FRANCIS B. MACDONALD } Secretaries.

LAW LIFE ASSURANCE SOCIETY,
FLEET STREET, LONDON.—Instituted 1823.

Assets on 31st December, 1884	£5,375,095
Income for the Year 1884	£454,633
Amount paid in claims to 31st Dec., 1884	£14,208,926
Reversionary Bonus allotted for the five years ending 31st Dec., 1884	£699 945
Reversionary Bonuses hitherto allotted	£6,889 937

The Expenses of Management, including Commission, are under 4½ per cent of the income.
The Limits of Free travel and residence have been largely extended, and rates of extra premium reduced.
Loans granted on security of Policies, Life Interests, Reversions, and on other approved securities.
Life interests and Reversions are purchased.
Claims paid immediately on proof of death and Title.
Commission allowed to Solicitors and others on Assurances effected through their introduction.
Prospectus and Form of Proposal sent on application to the Actuary.

105,000 ACCIDENTS
FOR WHICH
TWO MILLIONS
HAVE BEEN PAID AS
COMPENSATION
BY THE
RAILWAY PASSENGERS' ASSURANCE COMPANY,
64, CORNHILL.
ACCIDENTS OF ALL KINDS.
Paid-up and Invested Funds, £260,000.
Premium Income £235,000.
CHAIRMAN — HARVIE M. FARQUHAR, ESQ.
Apply to the Clerks at the Railway Stations, the Local Agents Or West End Office:—8, Grand Hotel Buildings, Charing Cross; or at the
HEAD OFFICE:—64, CORNHILL, LONDON, E.C.
WILLIAM J. VIAN, Secretary.

CURE OF DEAFNESS.
NOISES IN THE EARS. Rev. E. J. SILVERTON invites sufferers to send for his work, a book showing the nature of the disease and the means of cure. Post-free 6d., with letter of advice if case be stated. Imperial-buildings, Ludgate-circus, London. Free consultations daily.

PUBLISHED BY MESSRS. HATCHARD.

NEW BOOKS IN PREPARATION.

THAT CHILD.
By the Author of "The Atelier du Lys," "Mdlle. Mori," &c.
Illustrated by Gordon Browne. Crown 8vo, 5s.

KIRKE'S MILL, and other Stories.
By Mrs. O'REILLY, Author of "Phœbe's Fortune," &c.
Illustrated by Gordon Browne. Crown 8vo, 5s.

THE LION BATTALION, and other Stories.
By MARY E. HULLAH. With an Illustration by Alice M. Chambers.
Small crown 8vo, 3s. 6d.

HALCYON and ASPHODEL, and other Stories.
By A. L. H. A. Small crown 8vo. Illustrated. 3s. 6d.

THE BOOK of COMMON PRAYER for CHILDREN.
Arranged as read in Churches. With Texts and Proverbs, and Illustrated with Photographs.
24mo, in various bindings, from 3s. 6d. to 21s.

BY BRENDA.
Author of "Froggy's Little Brother," &c.

1. **OLD ENGLAND'S STORY.**
In Little Words for Little Children.
Square crown 8vo, 3s. 6d.. Illustrated by Sydney Hall and other artists.
"Well written, and free from the sentimentalism which infects so many of the historical books provided for the young."—Queen.
"A useful work for the nursery schoolroom."—Graphic.

2. **FYNIE'S FLOWER.**
Small crown 8vo, cloth, with Three Illustrations. 1s.
"Written with the same earnest piety which characterises the well-known works of the authoress of 'Nothing to Nobody;' when we have said that it is quite equal to its predecessors we have given the little book a sufficient recommendation."—John Bull.

3. **ESPECIALLY THOSE.**
With Three Illustrations. Small crown 8vo, 1s.
"A very touching little story. Will help to turn, for many, a form into a reality."—Guardian.

4. **WITHOUT a REFERENCE.**
Small crown 8vo. Illustrated. Price 3s. 6d.
"One of the most cleverly constructed and touchingly told stories we have ever met with."—Review.

SUNDAY STORIES FOR THE YOUNG BY MRS. MORTON.

1. **THE STORY of JESUS, for LITTLE CHILDREN.**
New Edition. Crown 8vo, Twelve full-page Illustrations, 3s. 6d.
"The Authoress, in carrying out her purpose of giving the Gospel story almost in full, yet in such simple language as to be readily understood by a child of four, or even less, has been very successful, not only in choosing appropriate words, but in exhibiting the narrati in an agreeable and picturesque style. We think it a very nice book for children, and we have no doubt that very young children will appreciate it, and be interested in it."—Queen.

2. **FROM the BEGINNING; or, Stories from Genesis.**
Fcap. 8vo, Illustrated, 3s. 6d.
"One of the best books of Bible stories for children that we have ever seen. Mothers cannot provide themselves with a better book to read to their little ones on Sunday. Mrs. Morton has conferred by the publication of her little work a real benefit on the dear children to whom she dedicates it."—Record.

3. **FROM EGYPT to CANAAN.**
Fcap. 8vo, cloth, with Four Illustrations and Map, 3s. 6d.
"Couched in plain and simple terms, the book, like its predecessor, is admirable for teaching children the main Scripture truth."—Graphic.
"Very nicely and reverently written."—Literary Churchman.

HATCHARDS, 187, PICCADILLY, LONDON,

WORKS FOR THE PROMOTION OF PURITY OF LIFE.

THE WHITE CROSS SERIES.

1. **AN ADDRESS to the MEMBERS of the WHITE CROSS ARMY.**
By the Right Rev. the Lord Bishop of DURHAM.
2. **THE WHITE CROSS MOVEMENT.** By Ellice Hopkins.
3. **PER ANGUSTA AD AUGUSTA.** By J. E. H.
4. **TRUE MANLINESS.** "
5. **MAN and WOMAN; or, The Christian Ideal.** By Ellice Hopkins.
6. **WILD OATS, or ACORNS?** By J. E. H.
7. **THE RIDE of DEATH.** By Ellice Hopkins.
8. **THE BLACK ANCHOR.** "
9. **THE BRITISH ZULU.** "
10. **GOD'S GREAT GIFT of SPEECH ABUSED.** "
11. **WHAT CAN WE DO?** "
12. **LITTLE KINDNESSES.** "
13. **THE CROCODILE and the LITTLE BIRDS.** "
14. **ENGLAND'S LAW for WOMEN and CHILDREN.** "
15. **THE MAN with the DRAWN SWORD.** "
16. **A STRANGE COMPANION.** By the Rev. George Everard.
17. **PURITY: The GUARD of MANHOOD.** A Confirmation Paper.
2d.; fifty at half price.
18. **DAMAGED PEARLS: an Appeal to Working Men.** By Ellice Hopkins.
19. **BLOOD-GUILTINESS.** By Rev. J. W. Horsley.
20. **THE PURITY MOVEMENT:** Cannot we use Existing Organisations?
21. **THE STANDARD of the WHITE CROSS:** Do we Need it? 2d. each.
22. **BURIED SEED.** By Ellice Hopkins.
23. **SAVED AT LAST!** "

Price 1d. each. Fifty or more Copies of each at half price, direct from the Publishers.

THE WHITE CROSS SERIES.—*Continued.*

SHORTER PAPERS, ½d., or 4d. a dozen.

Lost in Quicksand.
Is it Natural?
Moral Money-Clippers.
Who Holds the Rope?
Rolling Away the Stone.
Touching Pitch.
The Defaced Image Restored.
My Little Sister.
Ten Reasons why I Should Join.
Power to Let.
A White Cross Appeal.
By Rev. Professor Charteris, D.D.

LEAFLETS.

* **The Temple of the Eternal.**
* **The Devil's Chain.**
* **Saved by Fire.**
† **The Cracked Coin.**
* 4d. per dozen, or 2s. per hundred.

* **Address to the Members.**
By the Bishop of Durham.
* **A Practical Suggestion.**
By Ellice Hopkins.
† 2d. per dozen, or 1s. per hundred.

Nearly Half a Million of this Series have been sold.

HATCHARDS, 187, PICCADILLY, LONDON.

☞ *The attention of the* **Clergy** *and* **Ministers, Sunday-school Superintendents** *and* **Teachers, Parents** *and* **Guardians,** *and all interested in the spread of* **pure literature,** *is particularly directed at this time to*

THE QUIVER,

of which a New Volume will be commenced with the NOVEMBER PART, published October 26, price **6d.**

*** *A copy of the New Programme can be had at all Booksellers', or will be sent post free on application to* CASSELL and COMPANY, Limited, *Ludgate-hill, London.*

"The Quiver" Yearly Volume for 1885, forming a treasury of valuable reading, and containing 768 pages, 4to. size, with about **250 Illustrations,** is now ready, price **7s. 6d.**

New Serial Issue, in **Monthly Parts,** price **7d.**

The Child's Life of Christ.

With about **200 Original Illustrations** by Leading Artists, executed expressly for the Work.

Part 1 ready Oct. 26, price 7d.

"The Child's Life of Christ," says the *Times*, "is excellently adapted to its purpose. It is profusely illustrated, and the story of the ministry and death of our Lord is told in touching but singularly simple language, printed in the largest of type. The views of the scenery and cities of the Holy Land, the representations of the characteristic Jewish rites and ceremonials, the pictures from the Parables and of such incidents as the Raising of Lazarus and the Crucifixion, will give children a clearer idea of the manners of the East, and of the most memorable chapters in Sacred History, than any amount of mere verbal teaching."

*** *A Specimen Copy of* **Part 1** *will be sent post-free to any Clergyman on application to the Publishers,*

CASSELL and COMPANY, Limited, *Ludgate-hill, London.*

Now ready, the **First Monthly Volume,** price **1s.**, of

Cassell's Miniature Library of the Poets.

An exquisite Edition of our leading Poets (the size of the Volumes being 4⅞in. by 2¾in.) set in beautifully clear type, and elegantly bound in cloth, with marbled sides, or in vegetable parchment. The Series commences with Wordsworth, and will embrace the following Poets:—WORDSWORTH, LONGFELLOW, MILTON, SCOTT, HOOD, BURNS, BYRON, SHERIDAN and GOLDSMITH, and SHAKESPEARE.

CASSELL and COMPANY'S **LIST** *of* **NEW VOLUMES** *for the Season,* 1885-6, *containing particulars of nearly* **200 New Works,** *will be sent post-free on application to* CASSELL and COMPANY, Limited, *Ludgate-hill, London.*

W. M. THACKERAY'S HITHERTO UNCOLLECTED WRITINGS.

VOLUMES 25 & 26 OF THE **STANDARD EDITION** OF THE

COMPLETE WORKS of W. M. THACKERAY.

Now ready. Vol. 25. With Illustrations by the Author. Large 8vo, 10s. 6d.

MISCELLANEOUS ESSAYS, SKETCHES, AND REVIEWS.

*** The contents of this volume have not hitherto been included among Mr. Thackeray's collected works. They consist chiefly of contributions to Magazines, written when he was between twenty-six and thirty-five years of age, together with a few scattered papers belonging to a later period of his life. It is believed that this volume, and a volume yet to be issued, contain all Mr. Thackeray's early writings, which have not, from their slight and ephemeral nature, lost all interest from the mere lapse of time.

Volume XXVI., completing the "Standard Edition," will be published in November.

London: SMITH, ELDER, & CO., 15, Waterloo-place.

NEW VOLUME OF "THE DICTIONARY OF NATIONAL BIOGRAPHY."

Now ready, price 12s. 6d. in cloth; or in half-morocco, marbled edges, 18s.
Volume IV. (Beal to Biber), royal 8vo, of the

DICTIONARY OF NATIONAL BIOGRAPHY.

Edited by Leslie Stephen.

*** *Volume V. will be published on January* 1, 1886, *and the subsequent Volumes at intervals of Three Months.*

London: SMITH, ELDER, & CO., 15, Waterloo-place.

Crown 8vo, 256pp., cloth limp, 1s. 6d., post free. To the Clergy and Organists, 20 copies for £1 1s.

THE ANGLICAN PSALTER and CANTICLES

NEWLY ADAPTED TO ANGLICAN CHANTS OF AN ECCLESIASTICAL CHARACTER.

*** This Psalter is the most comprehensive of its kind, as it is certainly the cheapest. It contains 306 different Chant Tunes, and has 1,056 Scores of Music.

"This is a carefully compiled Psalter, and the explanatory notes at the commencement will be found exceedingly useful to those who have the management of the musical parts of the service. The pointing is to a certain extent founded on the Gregorian or mono-syllabic system, and the marks for showing the division of the chant are novel. Instead of bars, the circumflex and accent are used. There are no less than four different sets of chants annexed to each psalm, two of which are selected with especial reference to the true spirit of the psalm, while the other two sets are adapted for festal or penitential seasons. In churches where both Gregorian and Anglican chants are used, we think this will be found to be the most suitable Psalter yet published. The price, too, will probably assist in making this work acceptable."—The Musical Times.

The Venerable T. Bedford Jones, Archdeacon and Precentor of Ontario, says of Mr. Brown's Anglican Psalter, "My experience now, after some three years' use, confirms the conviction that Brown's pointing is the very best yet published, and most pleasing to the congregation, as they find it so much more easy to fall in with, and this for the simple reason that the *verses are pointed as read by a good reader.*"

Also separately, 48 pp., cloth, 6d., post free. To the Clergy and Organists, 20 copies for 7s. 6d.

THE ANGLICAN CANTICLES.

CONTAINING (WITH APPENDIX) 306 DIFFERENT CHANT TUNES.

THOMAS BOSWORTH and CO., 66, Great Russell-street, London, W.C.

Printed by E. D. Maddick and Co., 1, Crane Court, Fleet-street, and Published for the Proprietor, at the Office, No. 6, Whitefriars-street, Fleet-street,—Saturday, October 10, 1885.

SUPPLEMENT TO

JOHN BULL.

"FOR GOD, THE SOVEREIGN, AND THE PEOPLE!"

Registered at the General Post Office as a Newspaper.

VOL. LXV.
No. 3,386.

SATURDAY, OCTOBER 10, 1885.

GRATIS.

The Church Congress.

The Twenty-fifth Church Congress opened at Portsmouth on Tuesday with the usual sermons. The Bishop of CARLISLE preached at St. Thomas's Parish Church from Isaiah xxi., 11-12 verses, to a crowded congregation. In the course of an eloquent sermon the Right Rev. Prelate said: There were times in the lives of individuals and crises in the life of the nation when some one subject absorbed people's minds to the exclusion of all others. At the present moment a great constitutional change had been effected quietly and without revolution or bitter party conflict; and Churchmen could not but consider what the effect of that change would be upon the Church. There seemed to be no reason to suppose that there would be any violent attack upon the Church in the next Parliament, but a high authority had reminded us that throughout the civilised world a current was setting in against the connection of Church and State. Our Church of England, however, was the Church of the poor man, and it was difficult to see why the new voters should be hostile to it. At the same time, there was no doubt that an attempt would be made to effect a fundamental change in the position of the Church by what was called liberation from State control. There were some in favour of Disestablishment alone, but Disestablishment without Disendowment would make a very poor election cry. He trusted to English honesty to resist the cry of Disendowment, and hoped that Englishmen would continue to regard the national Church as their birthright. He claimed for the Church of England that it had worked well as a national institution, and had conferred benefits upon the people which no other institution could confer. It had preserved as no other Church had the primitive Catholic teaching free from the accretions and superstitions of the middle ages. For the last fifty years it had been perfecting its parochial system, carrying on the work of education, building parsonages, churches, and schools, and rearranging parishes, so as to bring the ministrations of the clergy within the reach of everybody. Was all that work to be asked to be undone? He appealed to our politicians and statesmen, to the old voters and those newly enfranchised, to cast aside party feeling upon this question, to determine that the Church of their forefathers should be the Church of their children; but they would strengthen her, supply what was wanting, renew what was decaying, and would not cripple her hands or combine with her enemies to lay her in the dust.

At All Saints', Landport, the Bishop of RIPON preached from 1 Kings iii. 27—"Give her the living child, and in no wise slay it; she is the mother of it;" and at St. Jude's, Southsea, the Bishop of DERBY preached from Revelation xxi. 5—"Behold, I make all things new."

In the afternoon the members assembled in the Congress Hall, which was crowded. The President (the Bishop of Winchester) occupied the chair, and was supported on the platform by the Bishops of Carlisle, Newcastle, Bath and Wells, Gibraltar, Archdeacon Palmer, Archdeacon Emery, Mr. T. C. Bruce, M.P., Mr. J. G. Talbot, M.P., and many others. The Mayor and Corporation of Portsmouth attended, attired in their official robes, and offered to the members a hearty welcome to the town. Subsequently a deputation of Nonconformists of Portsmouth, Gosport, and the surrounding district were introduced, and presented an address which stated that, notwithstanding the differences in their ecclesiastical organisation, they were pleased to approach the Congress with sincere congratulations in view of the importance of the Church's work throughout the country, the devotion and self-sacrifice of her ministers, and her great success in the cause of education, temperance, and social reform. The Rev. G. H. SANDWELL, Congregational minister, and others, spoke in support of the address.

The PRESIDENT, whose remarks were loudly cheered, expressed himself deeply touched by the kindness of the congratulations and good wishes of the deputation, whom he heartily thanked on behalf of the Congress. They were all fighting the same battle against sin, vice, and unbelief, and the Church of England would gladly offer every facility she could for the sake of union. She was prepared to enlarge her borders and to concede everything which was not absolutely essential in order to promote union. At present they must work on separate lines, but he hoped they would not be parallel but converging lines to one common end.

The deputation then withdrew.

The PRESIDENT then delivered his opening address. He said:—

My first and one of my pleasantest duties is to welcome the many honoured guests who have come to us from all parts of Great Britain and Ireland, from our colonial churches, and even from the Church of America, whose Prelates came over to us last year to celebrate the centenary of the consecration of their first Bishop. To all I bid a hearty welcome in the name of this ancient and historic diocese of Winchester, from this greatest of the naval cities of the world, and from the county of Hants—at one time the rival of London for the metropolitan dignity of its chief city. My next duty, and I perform it very heartily, is to thank the three eminent Prelates who have preached to us from the pulpits of our three largest churches, and to express a confident hope that their words of earnest wisdom will take root in the hearts and lives of all that heard them, and bring forth fruit abundantly. I must turn next to speak of the entertainment which we have provided for those who visit us. I need not say that the committees, and especially the secretaries, have devoted time and labour, and that ungrudingly and cheerfully, to this work, far more than those who have not been likewise engaged could possibly imagine. I shall venture to identify myself with them, though they have spared me as much as possible and only consulted me when my co-operation was needed. Well, we have tried not simply to "fight our battles o'er again," but to introduce as much variety in the list of subjects as we could reasonably do. We have also sought for new speakers and readers, lest by constant repetition we should weary you; and we must crave pardon from old and tried friends if some may seem to have been neglected by us. It is not that old friends are less honoured than new, or that their words are less weighty. Far from it. But it was thought that in both men and subjects there were "things old and new" which we should do well to bring out of our treasure. Circumstances both of time and place have naturally weighed with us. I had the honour last May to present the Revised Version of the Old Testament to the Convocation of Canterbury. I should like to say, as chairman of the Committee of Convocation, and also of the Old Testament Revisers, that, when fifteen years ago it was resolved to begin the work of revision, there was no intention on the part of those who moved in it to force it on against the will of the Church or of the people, or to force it when finished upon their general acceptance. On the contrary, it was thought, wisely or unjustly, that whereas so much light had been thrown on the criticism and on the language of Holy Scripture, an attempt should be made to let the Church at large share in that which was till then the exclusive possession of a few, and that when the work was done it should be freely laid before the Church and the world for their criticism, and, if it might be, for their emendations. A Church Congress seems a fitting opportunity for discussing its merits and its defects. I should gladly say something as to the principles on which we acted and the method of our action, but time will not permit me to do so, and I should, perhaps, anticipate what will be better done by those who will speak about it presently. The sitting of the Cathedral Commission, whose chairman we are happy in having among us, and its report concerning our own and other Cathedrals, naturally suggested one subject. The strong feeling in favour of making our service books more suitable to the present wants of our people, the need of supplementary services, the somewhat unsuccessful efforts to produce them, and the more promising labours of our brethren in America on what they call "The Book Annexed," have suggested one of the discussions for this evening. "Clergy Pensions" is another matter of present pressing importance. So certainly is the "Relation of Rich and Poor—Employers and Employed." It is a relation which will "never cease out of the land," but it tells specially now on all our interests and our hopes. "The Church and the Printing Press" is another subject of the day. The printing press has been a great blessing to the world, chiefly because it has enabled the Church to circulate freely the written word of God. But every instrument of man has a double edge. We are feeling keenly now the stabs, often stabs in the dark, of those who use the printing press for evil. Unless we are awake and at work, the preponderance of power may be on the side of evil, unbelief, and sin. The "Influence of Art on Religion and of Religion on Art" is another question of the day. So, again, "Legislative Proposals for the Repression of Intemperance" has become a political as well as a moral question. "The Attitude of the Church towards Movements in Foreign Churches" has assumed new proportions since the Vatican Council in 1870. It has been frequently discussed since then, but it loses nothing of its interest yet; and, as having been now for more than twenty years president of the Anglo-Continental Society, which has busied itself not unfruitfully in this matter, I ask your brotherly sympathy with those of our fellow-Christians who are striving under difficulties to maintain the Catholic faith free from Roman usurpation and from rationalising error. It was not, however, the design of the committee in choosing this subject to promote a general discussion of the Roman controversy. Our attitude to foreign Churches in general, and especially to recent movements in foreign Churches, may be—I trust it will be—one of brotherly (or sisterly) solicitude and affection, and a desire to help, if help be possible, rather than one of criticism or antagonism. There are, again, considerations which arise out of the almost appalling increase of our home population. Emigration is the only safety valve, which yet fails to relieve the perilous pressure. A population equal to that of a county leaves our shores yearly, and is spread abroad in our colonies and over the open continent of America. How do we help them? What becomes of them? What shall be their future as living, perishing, never-dying souls? But then, again, if emigration scarcely relieves the pressure of our teeming population, what shall we do for those that remain at home? This diocese may speak for all. When I came here twelve years ago I found the London portion of it growing at the rate of 25,000 a year. What a few years ago had been a green country of fields and market-gardens was covered with thickly crowded streets and alleys of small tradesmen, costermongers, and working men. In three or four years' time I succeeded in raising funds to divide the diocese. It threw off a portion, small in area but dense in houses and inhabitants, so that we lost a population of nearly 1,000,000 souls. Yet still the diocese of Winchester, after losing this 1,000,000 of men, has 200,000 more than the whole undivided diocese had when Bishop Sumner entered upon its episcopate not sixty years ago. The parochial system, which worked so well for our forefathers in quiet times, needs now to have its hands strengthened by evangelising agencies of all kinds, by ordained and unordained men and women, if it is to reach the hearts of the people, to civilise and reclaim them to Christ, hid as they are in the deep recesses of dense cities and scattered like sheep upon the mountains, which the shepherds cannot gather into folds. Cognate with these questions is that of "Church Defence." Those whom we have lost, or whom we imperfectly retain, are apt to look on us with the eyes of strangers, and to look on the Church of England as a stepmother—a stepmother to be cast out like the bondwoman with her children. Every unscrupulous effort is made to defame and ruin her. Have her children no words or will to defend her? Undoubtedly the best defence is earnest, well-organised, and united work, springing from faith in God and from love to man; but when that which is the truest heritage of the poor is threatened on all sides, it is but well that the poor themselves should learn how great their inheritance is, and how to preserve it. It is, indeed, true of the Church, and we may well trust in that truth, that "no weapon which is formed against her shall prosper." She is as safe in adverse as she can be in prosperous times. But the people which casts off its national faith may and very certainly will be the loser. Possibly it may be found that every such people will lose in worldly as much as in spiritual prosperity. Many causes have of late called attention to special work among men. It is always easier to reach women. They are more at home. They are more dependent. Their sensitive nature is more open to religious impressions. Men have to be sought out and waited for; but if you once win the strong man he becomes an efficient warrior for the faith, a centre of strength and power. We have also become painfully alive to the fact that purity of life cannot be maintained by purity of female life only, and that our failure hitherto has been great in the efforts to train up Christian boys and men from early childhood in habits of purity and self-restraint and holiness. Terrible revelations have been made, which cannot be neglected. How to deal with men so as to save us from the evils which are rife in the midst of us is almost the problem of the day. I will only say that here I am sure we shall not treat such questions so that, under show of probing the wound and healing it, we only lay it open, aggravate its ghastly horrors, and spread it onward to healthier surroundings. The work of women in the Church is of universal interest, and of peculiar interest in this diocese. Local and other causes have produced this interest among us. We have nearly the most flourishing branch of the Girls' Friendly Society in England. We have deaconesses doing work of incalculable good in Portsmouth and other parts of the diocese. We have devoted women working in our penitentiaries and elsewhere. We have penitentiary and rescue work on a large scale and on systematic principles working throughout the diocese, and our deaconesses have homes for little children rescued from evil surroundings. We have homes, too, for rough girls and other like agencies. And so we have both a local and general interest in all. We wish to tell you something of what we are doing. We want to learn from you how to do it better, so that we may all help and be helped. There are other subjects suggested to us locally. It has been the privilege of this diocese within the last five years to raise funds for founding a new Indian diocese, the diocese of Rangoon, and its first Bishop was a parish priest from among ourselves. We have been led by the thought of this to ask your attention to the Church in India, in preference to inviting you to wander over the whole wide mission-field of the world. Once more, we have the greatest naval station of the greatest of maritime nations where we are met to-day. We have great military garrisons here and elsewhere, and also the camp at Aldershot, where from 10,000 to 20,000 soldiers are constantly massed together. Thus we have naturally thought of directing your attention to the delicate and difficult question, "The doctrine of Holy Scripture and the attitude of the Church with respect to war." We want, too, to ask your counsel and to elicit your opinions on the spiritual interests of those brave men who fight our battles for us, and who, by being always prepared for war, have, under God's good Providence, kept our homes in peace. We who live in this diocese know how much there is to love in the rough, honest hearts of soldiers and sailors. We would learn how to rescue them from the moral and spiritual dangers to which they are exposed, and to teach them, amid their wanderings and fightings, to look for an abiding peace and for an eternal home. Besides our working men's meeting, which is a constant element in a Congress, we have provided for a special meeting of soldiers and sailors. The *Victory*, recalling our greatest naval successes, and the most honoured of our naval heroes, floats in our waters. We hope that we have secured the presence and help of one who bears his name and honours, and who is ever ready to help on work for man and for God. There are but two other more general subjects to which I have not yet referred—viz., "The Teaching Work of the Church," and "The Trials and Helps of the Spiritual Life." Though I have kept them to the last, they may claim to be the most important of all. Religious teaching and spiritual life seem well nigh to embrace all that belongs to life and godliness. We are happy in having secured speakers on these points at whose feet we shall be glad to sit, and from whose mouths we shall be sure to learn wisdom. I have left but little time to speak of the Congress itself and of its general purposes, yet this is an era in its history. It has lived and worked for just a quarter of a century. Five and twenty years ago it was a new and doubtful experiment. It has steadily won its way. It has held its annual sittings in every part of England, once in Ireland, and once in Wales. It shows no sign of decadence, as it grows in age. This is a proof that it has met a want, and in part has satisfied it. My right rev. brother who presided last year at the Carlisle Congress referred to the revival of Convocation eight years earlier, in 1852, and to the feeling which then grew up in favour of consultation with laymen, as supplementary to the reanimated counsels of the clergy. I am the only living Bishop, I am one of but three or four of the clergy now living, who sat and took part in that Convocation of 1852, after its voice had been silent for some century and a quarter. I can well say that we, who then met together in but small numbers at the Jerusalem Chamber, rejoiced with trembling. Parliament was hostile to us; public opinion was unfavourable to us; Church and even clerical opinion was but divided concerning us. By the year 1860, however, Convocation had nearly established its constitutional right to meet and to debate, Still, there was an anxious questioning whether there ought not to be a lay element, either in Convocation itself, or outside Convocation, but able to take common counsel with it. Difficulties of many kinds were in the way, and perhaps happily in the way. It is due to the zeal and energy of two clergymen—both at that time Fellows of colleges at Cambridge, one of whom has (alas for us!) passed to his rest, the other with us still, thank God—that this expedient of Church Congress was devised and tried. It met first at Cambridge in the hall of King's College. The numbers were small. The College Hall could have held twice as many. The Bishop of the diocese was too old and feeble to preside. The Archdeacon of Ely represented him. There was no member of the home Episcopate with us. My old and revered tutor at Eton, Bishop Chapman, formerly Bishop of Colombo, was the only representative of the then living Bishops. But the meeting was a success; so much of a success that it was resolved to repeat it the next year at Oxford. Bishop Wilberforce gave it his presence and countenance, and it has ever since gone on growing and advancing. Bear with me if I say a word or two *in memoriam* as I pass onwards. Very many of those who met in King's College Hall in 1860 have gone away from us. The aged Bishop of the diocese, my own immediate predecessor at Ely, Bishop Turton, died three years afterwards, and the Archdeacon, who took the chair for him, Archdeacon France, followed him in the same year. The Rev. W. Beamont, who, with Archdeacon Emery, founded the Congress, was called away very suddenly a few years later, in the midst of earnest and zealous work for God. For some time, both in Congresses and in Diocesan Conferences, which soon after came into being, it was difficult to enlist the help of laymen. There was one conspicuous figure at the Cambridge Congress, dressed in somewhat antiquated fashion, with his long hair flowing on his shoulders, whom most of us can recall, for he has been at almost every Congress since, till his strength gave way and he could no longer encounter the fatigue. I am speaking of Charles Longuet Higgins. I had known him since 1828, now 57 years since. No one that ever knew him could help but love and honour him. As a country gentleman, as a landlord, as a friend to the poor, as a Christian and as a Churchman, he seemed a pattern of what man should be. As a private friend, and as a constant supporter of all good works in the diocese in which I once presided, I cannot speak of him too affectionately or too gratefully. He, too, is lost to us only during the past year. So it is ever with us. Men must come and men must go, but God's work goes on for ever, and we must work for Him, while the light is left to us. May we hope that we are working for Him in these Congresses? We trust, indeed, that it is so. Every great work in which many men are working requires consultation. Perhaps until lately the Church of England had had less of consultation than any other large body of workers in the world. The Archbishop of Canterbury said, not long ago, that our great need was consultation. Our organisations for discussion and counsel and joint help are singularly imperfect. Parochial counsels are but few, diocesan conferences are very different in different dioceses, Convocation is unlike any other Provincial Synod. We are, it may be, struggling into some better shape; but,

meanwhile, Congress has supplied a want which was felt and which was true. We do want very much to speak of our wants. We do desire to give utterance to our sense of defective machinery and defective action, of wrongs real or imaginary, in the hope that defects may be supplied and wrongs set right. We want, not only gatherings of clergy, who have necessarily clerical prejudices, nor of men all of one school of thought, who have necessarily party prejudices; we want to speak out to others words that we desire them to hear, and we want to hear from them what it is right and well that they should speak to us. And we want this in the gathering together of Christian men and women, in the open light of heaven, with invocation of the presence of God and of the guidance of his Holy Spirit. We want the sense of our responsibility to Him and of our responsibility to our brethren in Him. We do not want to be fighting one another with poisoned pens in the pages of party newspapers, till each side becomes more and more envenomed and embittered against the other. Rather may we speak openly face to face, and heart to heart, restrained by our common courtesy, restrained by the honest shame of meeting each other's countenance; restrained by the memory that we are all children of the one Great God, redeemed by one blessed Son of God, baptised to be temples of the Eternal Spirit of God.

At the conclusion of his address the President again referred to the fact that Archdeacon Emery and the late Rev. W. J. Beamont were the founders of the Church Congress; and as a memento of the 25th anniversary he presented the Archdeacon with a valuable gold watch, bearing an appropriate inscription. Archdeacon Emery having briefly acknowledged the gift, the assembly resolved itself into sectional meetings.

CONGRESS HALL.

In the afternoon, the subject was—

THE REVISED VERSION OF THE OLD TESTAMENT.

The first paper was by the Bishop of Bath and Wells, as follows:—

The Revised Version of the Old Testament has now been before the public long enough for a fair judgment to be formed about it, and for a considerable number of independent criticisms, made from different standpoints, both by competent and incompetent critics, to have gone forth concerning it. These criticisms, whether adverse or favourable—and it is very pleasant to feel that the favourable judgments decidedly preponderate—have been of great use in directing my attention to points which I might otherwise have overlooked, and so helping me to a more comprehensive view of my subject than I might otherwise have attained.

I. In regard to revision itself in the abstract. There is doubtless a considerable body of opinion distinctly opposed to any change in that Authorised Version of Holy Scripture which men have been accustomed from their childhood to receive as the Word of God. It is natural for the human mind to desire absolute certainty in the region of religious truth. Besides other influences (and many might be named), timidity and indolence of mind join hands in requiring to be relieved of the effort to think, to judge, and to decide. This is seen especially with reference to the Holy Scriptures.

We see it in the fable concerning the LXX. Version, which tells us that the seventy-two translators, being shut up separately in seventy-two cells (or, as some say, in thirty-six) in the island of Pharos, each came forth at the end of seventy-two days with his translation complete, and that the seventy-two translations were all *verbum et literatim* the same (Prideaux, vol. ii., p. 23-30); whence it was naturally inferred that the interpreters "had every word dictated to them by the Holy Spirit of God." And we know that this belief in the inspiration of the Alexandrian Version was not confined to the Jews, but passed on to the Christian Church. Justin Martyr held it most strongly; and, to pass over others, St. Augustine was of opinion that the LXX. were "prophets rather than translators;" and he objected to the use of St. Jerome's Version from the Hebrew that "it seemed to impair the authority of the LXX.; and would be a grave scandal to the Christian laity, who were accustomed to a version which had the sanction of the Apostles" (Hieron. Op. Tom. iv., p. 641). And yet a little later that very Latin Version of St. Jerome was deemed by the Council of Trent to be "authentic"—*i.e.*, the authoritative text of Holy Scripture, and a particular (very faulty) edition of it was declared by a constitution of Sixtus V. "out of the plentitude of his Apostolic power" to be the true, lawful, authoritative, and undoubted page of Holy Scripture.

There is, then, clearly a disposition in the mind of man to desire absolute certainty in the text of Holy Scripture; and to attribute that infallible certainty to the particular text, whether Greek, Latin, or English, from which it has habitually received the great teaching of revelation. But that this disposition is not in accordance with the mind and purpose of God seems clear from the following considerations.

That revelation of God of His Person, His will, His law, His dealings with mankind—past, present, and future which is profitable and necessary for man to receive, and which is *authentic*, has been delivered in only two [The few chapters in Chaldee need not be taken into account] languages—the Hebrew and the Greek. It is a revelation of grace intended for the whole race of men, speaking numerous languages and dialects; but the Holy Ghost has given it in only two forms of speech. How, then, is it the purpose of God that it should be communicated to those many families of mankind to whom those two languages are unknown tongues? By a series of renewed inspirations?—by ever-recurring gifts of prophecy?—by miraculous interpretations?—or by the faithful and diligent use of natural gifts, and of knowledge acquired by industry, by men of God who love God's Word, and desire to make it accessible to every child of man on the face of the broad earth? Clearly this latter is the method designed by God. And since this method necessarily involves some amount of uncertainty, I infer, without any manner of doubt, that God sees it better for His Church, which He loves, that such a measure of uncertainty should exist; that there should be constant room for the diligence and zeal of His people struggling upwards toward perfection; that there should be in this direction, as in so many others, a constant employment of gifts in some members for the good of the whole body; that there should be exercise for the humility of the teacher and the docility of the taught; and that the great mind of the Church should constantly be raised above the narrow servility of the letter to the wider and holier freedom of the spirit.

It follows from this view that it is the duty of each Church to provide for its members the *most faithful translation possible* of the original revelation of Holy Scriptures. Her power to do so does not spring from "the plentitude of her Apostolic power;" there is no such thing in the Church of God as a supernatural authority to translate Hebrew or Greek into English or any other tongue, or to correct the press; but we believe that with the guidance and blessing of Almighty God sought in prayer, and by the careful use of all the appliances within their reach, Christian men of competent learning and ability may arrive, gradually, progressively, as new helps are provided, at a more exact knowledge of the meaning of all Holy Scripture, and at a more exact representation of that meaning in the language of their own people.

II. To assist in arriving at this more exact representation of the meaning of Holy Scripture was the task which the Old Testament Revision Company accepted at the hands of the Convocation of Canterbury, and which they have fulfilled to the best of their ability. They began their undertaking with a very high estimate of the excellence of the Authorised Version, and I believe they ended it with a higher estimate still. The scholarly acquaintance of the translators of 1611 with the Hebrew language, their thorough mastership of the noble English tongue, and their elevation of thought and expression to the level of the grand sentiments which they were dealing with, became only more apparent the more closely their work was scrutinised. But we knew that it was only a human work, itself the result of revision upon revision, and still susceptible of improvement. With reverence, therefore, with the tenderness of love, but without any superstitious fear of substituting human learning for Divine inspiration, we entered upon our task. That task, let me repeat it, was to represent in good English as *exactly* as we could the meaning of Holy Scripture wherever the Authorised Version had failed, or seemed to us to have failed, in doing so. What determined any particular rendering was not the influence it might have in favouring orthodox doctrine, or its bearing upon Church views, or any other views, but the opinion of the company that it was the best and truest expression in English of the Hebrew words before them. We acted as translators and not as prophets. Not we, but the Hebrew writers, were responsible for the orthodoxy, or the morality, or the piety, of the sentiments delivered by them. Our responsibility was confined to expressing in good English the natural meaning of the Hebrew words.

Our helps in arriving at that meaning were the following:—

First, and chiefly, sound philology; such knowledge of the Hebrew tongue and of kindred Semitic languages, as the company possessed, aided by the scholarship of the best commentators, ancient and modern, English, German, and French, as well as Hebrew, Greek, or Latin.

Secondly, the traditional interpretations of the ancient Rabbinical schools. In determining the meaning of unknown words, and in cases where the voice of philology is uncertain, these traditional interpretations have a certain weight, and they were not neglected by us.

Thirdly, the ancient versions, of which the most important are the LXX., the Peshito (or Syriac), and the Vulgate. To which I ought to add the Targums. Each of these ancient versions and paraphrases is a witness of the judgment of the most learned men, in the time when they were made, as to the meaning of the passages with which they were dealing. And though complicated questions often arise as to the text which those translators had before them, and its identity with the present Hebrew text, and though occasionally there are manifest signs of incompetency in the translators, and in no case can they be looked upon as infallible, still they are an important factor in the sum total of our resources for arriving at the truth, and can never be neglected with impunity.

Fourthly, as applicable to a limited number of passages, there are the quotations by our Lord and the Apostles in the New Testament out of the Old Testament Scriptures. At first sight it might appear that the meaning assigned to a passage out of the Law, or the Psalms, or the Prophets, by our Saviour, or by an Apostle, was a conclusive proof of the true meaning of such a passage, and an infallible guide to the modern translator. But a little consideration will show that the matter is not so simple as our first thoughts would suggest.

There are in the New Testament upwards of six hundred quotations from the Old Testament. [Gough on the quotations in the New Testament.] These are for the most part taken from the Version of the LXX. If in all these passages the LXX. exactly represented the Hebrew text, and the New Testament quotations exactly followed the Alexandrian Version, no doubt the translator would have a very cogent argument to impel him to an identical translation. But this is far from being the case. In some of the passages quoted the LXX. reading is quite different from the Hebrew text. Take, as a familiar example, the quotation from Hos. xiii. 14 in 1 Cor. xv. 55. There the Hebrew text has אְהִי דְבָרֶיךָ מָוֶת אְהִי קָטָבְךָ שְׁאוֹל: "O death I will be thy plagues, O grave I will be thy destruction" (Authorised Version). But the LXX. has ποῦ ἡ δίκη σου θάνατε; ποῦ τὸ κέντρον σοῦ ᾅδη; which St. Paul follows in the main. "O death where is thy sting? O grave where is thy victory?" The difference, if the authorised Version is right, arising from the LXX. having read אַיֵּה *where*, for the Hebrew reading אְהִי *I will be*. In such a case the New Testament quotation is no guide to the right translation of the Hebrew text. Again, in Gen. xlvii. 31, we read that "Israel bowed himself upon the bed's head." עַל רֹאשׁ הַמִּטָּה: But the LXX. have ἐπὶ τὸ ἄκρον τῆς ῥάβδου αὐτοῦ, *upon the top of his staff*, and the writer of the Hebrews (Heb. xi. 21) follows them in this rendering. They read מַטֶּה *a staff* for מִטָּה *a bed*.

In Gen. xlvi. 27 we read "All the souls of the house of Jacob which came into Egypt were three score and ten." But the LXX. read, "Seventy-five souls;" and in accordance with the LXX. St Stephen says, Acts vii. 14, "Joseph called his father Jacob to him and all his kindred, three score and fifteen souls."

We do not render עֹז *praise* in Psalm viii. 2, because, our Lord in quoting it follows the LXX., and says "Out of the mouth of babes and sucklings thou hast perfected *praise* (Matt. xxi. 16), instead of *ordained strength*.

We do not render קָוֹם in Ps. xix. 4 "their voice" (קוֹלָם) instead of *their line*, because St. Paul follows the LXX. in reading ὁ φθόγγος αὐτῶν in Romans x. 18; neither do we render כָּרִיתָ לִי אׇזְנָיִם in Ps. xl. 6 (*mine ears hast thou opened*) *a body hast thou prepared me*, because the LXX. Version, σῶμα κατηρτίσω μοι, is quoted in Heb. x. 5, and reasoned upon.

The quotation from Hos. xiv. 3, καρτὸν χειλέων in Heb. xiii. 15 does not decide the question whether the Prophet wrote פָּרִים *calves*, or פְּרִי *fruit*; nor do we translate Is. lix. 20 with the LXX. ἀποστρέψει ἀσεβείας ἀπὸ Ἰακωβ *he shall turn away ungodliness from Jacob*, because St. Paul thus quotes the words in accordance with the LXX., and not in accordance with the Hebrew text, *them that turn from transgression from Jacob*. And, to give but one more out of many examples, because our Lord, in the synagogue of Nazareth, as St. Luke reports His words, read καὶ τυφλοῖς ἀνάβλεψιν, *recovering of sight to the blind*, as the rendering of לַאֲסִירִים פְּקַח קוֹחַ, in Is. lxi. 1, we do not feel it a duty to forsake the rendering "*the opening of the prison to them that are bound*," which is that of the Authorised Version.

Obviously, then, the authority of the quotations in the New Testament must be used with extreme caution in determining the proper renderings of the Hebrew text. It is true that there are cases in which their authority has a just weight. In such a passage, *e.g.*, as Ps. xvi. 10, when there is a doubt in some minds whether the word שַׁחַת rendered "*corruption*" may not mean rather "*pit*"—but where philological reasons are in favour of the meaning "corruption," the additional authority of the LXX., and the evidence from St. Peter's and St. Paul's quotations of it (Acts ii. 27, 31; xiii. 35, 37), that it was the received interpretation among the Jews, seem to decide the question; and so *corruption* stands in the Revised Version. And this is the general principle upon which the Revisers have acted. They have endeavoured to decide mainly on philological grounds, but in all doubtful cases have given full weight to the authority of tradition, of the Versions, and the New Testament quotations.

And here, perhaps, it may be well to say one word as to the marginal readings, which have received some unfriendly criticisms. The marginal readings, in many cases, represent those renderings of the text which seemed to the company to have a certain amount of reasoning in their favour. They are alternative renderings, judged by the company not to be the best renderings, but still having a sufficient show of authority, and a sufficient amount of philological support, to entitle them to a second place in the revision. If the company had excluded all such alternative readings, and especially if they had excluded them on the ground that though they were supported on philological grounds by eminent Hebrew scholars, they did not square with doctrinal prepossessions, they would have been acting the part, not of "interpreters, but of prophets." Other uses of the margin are noted in the Preface to the Revised Version, and need not here be repeated.

III. I now pass on to point out a few passages in which changes have been made, either important in themselves, or likely to arrest the attention of the reader.

(1) The first is that which occurs six times in the first chapter of Genesis, where, instead of "the evening and the morning were the first—second—third—day," we read "and there was evening, and there was morning, one day, a second day, a third day, &c.—and—the sixth day." I confess that I do not like the alteration. I do not think that "one day" is here the right English for יוֹם אֶחָד; I do not think that the use of the indefinite article in vv. 8, 13, 19, 23 (*a* second, *a* third, *a* fourth, &c.) and of the definite article in v. 31 "*the* sixth" marks any intelligible difference of meaning in English, nor do I think that the rendering in the Revised Version (there was evening, and there was morning) gives any material variation of sense from the Authorised Version, while it is much less idiomatic English.

(2) 1 Sam. xiii. 1 stood in the Authorised Version, "Saul reigned one year; and when he had reigned two years over Israel," so and so. Now, by no possibility could the Hebrew words bear the meaning here ascribed to them. The marginal note in the Revised Version says truly that the Hebrew text has "Saul was a year old when he began to reign." The Hebrew words cannot possibly mean anything else. And as we know that that is not true we are also quite sure that it is not the proper reading. The Revised Version inserts in a bracket, and in italics, the numeral *thirty*, which is found in some various readings appended to the Roman or Vatican edition of the LXX., and is a very probable statement of Saul's age at his accession to the throne. But the revisers thought themselves unable to correct the latter half of the verse, which tells us that Saul "reigned two years over Israel," a statement quite as embarrassing as that which makes him one year old at his accession. The truth is that the verse in question, which is entirely wanting in the LXX., occurs *thirty-eight times* in the historical Books of Samuel, Kings, and Chronicles. It is the annalists' technical formula prefixed to the reign of each king, to which was sometimes added the name of the Queen mother. In the case of Saul, the first King, this formula would probably be wanting in the original annals of his reign, but would be added later when the whole history was made up into one book as we now have it. Possibly the proper numerals were never inserted. A special reason for the insertion of the formula, besides the desire to make Saul's reign uniform with that of the other Kings, may be found in the fact that the events related in the thirteenth chapter and onward all belong to about the last ten years of Saul's reign. The earlier events are included in the formula.

What, however, concerns us now is to note the important correction of the first half of this verse, and to show how the correction of the second half, necessary, obvious, and certain as it is, did not fall within the scope of the revisers' work, which was to translate the text of the Hebrew and not to correct it.

(3) Turn next to 2 Sam. i. 18, where in the Authorised Version we read "also He bade them teach the children of Israel the use of the bow," a statement which everybody must feel to be untrue, and utterly irrelevant if it was true. Nor can the grammar be justified by Hebrew usage. But in the Revised Version we read, "And he bade them *teach* the children of Israel the *song of* the bow;" that beautiful song in which the generous Psalmist celebrated the *bow* of his fallen friend, and which he would have the children of Israel *commit to memory* for a perpetual monument of the prowess of the King and his brave and gentle son: just as Moses *taught* the children of Israel the words of his song, that it might be a lasting witness against them (Deut. xxxi. 19, 22). Here sentiment, fact, and grammar are all harmonised by the change.

(4) In Exod. xii. 36 the Authorised Version has—"*They lent unto them such things as they required*," where the word "lent" implies a promise on the part of the Israelites to repay what they borrowed. The following words, "*and they spoiled the Egyptians*," seem thus to approve an act of successful dishonesty in borrowing and not paying. But the Hebrew word וַיַּשְׁאִלוּם merely means "they let them have what they asked;" and so accordingly the Revised Version has it. In like manner, in 1 Sam. i. 28, where the Authorised Version has "*I have lent him to the Lord*," &c., the Revised Version has "*I have granted him to the Lord*," *i.e.*, I have let the Lord have him, which is otherwise expressed by Hannah herself in v. 11—"I will give him unto the Lord all the days of his life," where there can be no question of repayment.

(5) Let us turn now to the familiar and important passage in Is. ix. It is not too much to say that the Authorised Version of ver. 1—"*When at the first he lightly afflicted the land of Zebulun and the land of Naphtali, and afterward did more grievously afflict her*," &c., is quite devoid of sense, neither is it the natural and obvious rendering of the Hebrew. The Revised Version, "*In the former time He brought into contempt the land of Zebulun and the land of Naphtali, but in the latter time hath he made it glorious*," and so on, is both a literal version of the Hebrew and is intelligible and in accordance with history, and with the obvious purpose of the Prophet to describe the glory shed upon Galilee by the presence of the Saviour. Again, the third verse in the Authorised Version, "*Thou hast multiplied the nation, and not increased the joy*," followed as it is by "*They joy before Thee according to the joy in harvest*," is also devoid of sense. But the Revised Version, "*Thou hast multiplied the nation and increased their joy. They joy before Thee according to the joy in harvest, as men rejoice when they divide the spoil*," is both good sense, and lively imagery, and a faithful rendering of the Hebrew. The Authorised Version was probably misled by the Vulgate to follow the Cethib לֹא *not*, instead of the Keri לוֹ *his* or *their*—two words which, being of identical sound, are often confused by the transcribers.

(6) As an example of bringing out the sense of a passage clearly which before was obscure, we may take the passage in Job which has furnished the occasion for so many witticisms—I mean Job xxxi. 35, *Oh! that mine adversary had written a book*. The Revised Version has *Oh! that I had the indictment which mine adversary hath written:* a translation which not only clears the meaning of the words themselves, but throws light upon the whole context by showing that Job draws his imagery from the practice of courts of law. It is also an example of the introduction of a new word (indictment) into the Bible vocabulary, and is a typical instance of such rare introduction.

IV. Passing over many other passages to which I should have been glad to call your attention, I would now group together a few special circumstances in the Hebrew Bible which have to be dealt with by the translator, and the consideration of which will help you to estimate aright the difficulties with which the revisers have had to contend.

(1) As regards the designation of God. The term אֱלֹהִים designates alike the true and living God, Creator of heaven and earth; the false gods of the heathen; the angels and judges. Ps. lxxxii. 1, 6. In such passages as Gen. i. 1, Deut. iv. 8, there is no difficulty in determining that in the first it should be rendered *God* in the singular, and in the second *gods* in the plural. But in such passages as Gen. iii. 5 (Ye shall be as God, or gods), Dan. iii. 23 (son of God), v. 11 (the spirit of the Holy Gods), it is very difficult to determine, and opinions will differ. So the rendering of Ps. viii. 5 (lower than the *angels*, Authorised Version), or *God* (Revised Version), xcvii. 7, *gods*, or *angels*, must be doubtful.

(2) The name which is written *Jehovah* in English has no existence in Hebrew. *Jehovah* is made up of the consonants of the ineffable name vocalised by the vowels of the word *Adonai*, which the Jews always pronounced instead of the ineffable name. Moreover the name does not occur at all in the New Testament, but in all the quotations from the Old Testament in which that name appears (as Matt. xxii. 44; xxi. 9; Mark xii. 29, &c.) we have κύριος, the Lord, as in the LXX. Were the revisers to write *Jehovah*, or were they to follow the Authorised Version in writing "the Lord" as representing the ineffable name? They have written Jehovah (though there is no such word really) in a few passages where the introduction of a proper name seemed to be required; but as a rule they have adhered to "the Lord."

The reasons for doing so were too cogent to permit them to do otherwise.

(3) The Hebrew language is wanting in those numerous conjunctive or disjunctive particles which in English mark the relation of sentences to one another. Sentences in Hebrew are, so to speak, laid side by side, and the reader has to determine to a great extent, unaided by any grammatical contrivances, what is their exact relation to one another. Hence the common copulative particle ו ordinarily rendered "and," has to be also rendered according to

circumstances, *but, since, for, that, to the end that, therefore, though, or, both, who, so, namely, when,* and, according to Noldius, in seventy-three different ways—*quae nunc perscribere longum est.* In some cases it is almost impossible to decide in complicated sentences where the protasis ends and the apodosis of the sentence begins. The obscurity of the tenses of Hebrew verbs, again, and the entire absence of the pluperfect, is another source of doubt and difficulty. And to mention only one more obstacle in the way of representing clearly to the English eye the meaning of a Hebrew writer, it by no means follows that the sequence of events in the narrative represents the sequence of events in their actual occurrence—*e.g.*, Gen. xii. 1 does not follow Gen. xi. 32. The Authorised Version indicated this by the pluperfect, "The Lord had said." The Revised Version indicates it less distinctly, by the use of *Now* instead of *And*. Judg. xx. furnishes many examples of this anticipation and retrogression in the course of the narrative, 1 Sam. xvi. 21 another, Gen. xxxvii. 5 another, and there are many more.

And if to the above special circumstances we add the occurrence of many ἅπαξ λεγόμενα—words which only occur once and are of doubtful meaning; the remote antiquity of some of the records; the undoubted corruption of the Hebrew text in some in some passages; and the widely different modes of thought and of expression in the Oriental mind from those of the Western nations, we shall be better able to appreciate the difficulty of transferring the words of Hebrew prophets and psalmists into correct, clear, and readable English.

These and other difficulties the revisers have endeavoured to meet and overcome to the best of the ability vouchsafed to them by God. They began, continued, and ended their work in dependence upon His guidance and blessing. They felt from the very first entrance upon their labours the responsibility of handling those Holy Scriptures, which for two or three thousand years and upwards have been as a lamp let down from heaven to give shine to the world; they felt scarcely less the responsibility of meddling with that grand mass of pure English and sound scholarship which makes up the Authorised Version of the Holy Bible; and so they resolved to make no changes in it that were not absolutely required. It added to the weight of the task they had undertaken to reflect that they were acting not for the Anglican Church alone, but for all Bible-reading Christians in the British Empire; and not for the British Empire only, but for the English-speaking people of the New World, for our American brethren, who had given us the right hand of fellowship in our arduous task, and were helping us with their counsel and advice. If the sense of the wide partnership in which we were engaged checked any latent disposition in any of our number at any time to follow the prompting of ecclesiastical, nay, or even of Christian prepossessions, rather than the judicial decisions of such scholarship as we possessed, I for one rejoice at the result. The more absolutely free from bias our work is seen to be, the weightier is its testimony to those Divine truths which the Church is commissioned to teach, and in which Christians find their present joy, and the assurance of their eternal salvation. However, such as it is, I venture to commend our work to the charitable consideration of our brethren in the wide world. That there are some blots in it, some failures, some shortcomings, who can doubt? It is a human work. But I think I may say that the company spared neither time nor mental labour to make it as perfect as they could.

And now, my lord, and my dear brethren, I have done. I have said ill what I meant to say. I have left unsaid much that I ought rather to have said. But you have heard me with indulgence, and I thank you. I sit down with merely the expression of a devout hope that the Revised Version of the Old Testament may give a stimulus to the intelligent study of those matchless writings which holy men of God, moved by the Holy Ghost, have handed down to us, and which by a wonderful Providence, have been preserved to our days, to lighten our spiritual darkness amidst the blaze of scientific light, and to point out to us the way which leads to eternal life.

The next paper was by the Rev. Dr. Driver, Regius Professor of Hebrew and Canon of Christ Church, who said:—

The questions which I propose to consider, in the time allotted me, are three:—I. Why a revision of the English Old Testament was deemed necessary. II. The difficulties attending it. III. May the result be regarded as adequate and satisfactory?

I. More than two hundred and fifty years have elapsed since King James's translators completed their work. A century of singular activity in the labour of Bible translation had just closed. Throughout Europe the writings of the most eminent Jewish scholars, diffused by the printing press, had been studied with avidity; and in England a series of translations had appeared, each, both in accuracy and literary form, marking an advance upon the one preceding it. King James's translators, equipped (as their work abundantly shows) with all the learning of their time, and endowed with a rare command of the English tongue, revised and remodelled their predecessors' work. In scholarship they brought their version fully up to the capabilities of their age: in a literary point of view, they presented it in a form which may, perhaps, be imitated, but cannot be surpassed. Why, then, has a revision been deemed necessary now? Why does the Authorised Version not satisfy the requirements of the present day? The answer is not far to seek, though it can only be indicated here in outline.

The progress of years has brought fresh light to bear upon nearly every department of knowledge, and has revealed, what was not fully recognised in the seventeenth century, the need and the value of methods of study at once more comprehensive and more precise. A change has thus come as well over the methods of history and archæology as over the critical and philological study of the records of antiquity. In the field of Hebrew studies the change has been gradual. The century which followed the appearance of the Authorised Version saw the first advances made. Edward Pocock travelled in the East, brought back Arabic learning to England, and discerned its importance in the explanation of the Hebrew Scriptures. In the next century Albert Schultens, pursuing further the path thus opened, realised distinctly the philological value of Arabic in Hebrew lexicography. In the hands of his followers the key was apt to be applied too freely: Gesenius defined the limits within which both Arabic and the other cognate dialects might be safely used by the lexicographer. The Arabic-speaking Jews of the eleventh and twelfth centuries had indeed not been unconscious of the help to be derived from this quarter; but their writings were unknown, or known only indirectly, to the scholars of the Reformation period, and it is only in the present century that a critical and systematic use of the cognate Semitic languages for the elucidation of Hebrew has become possible. Secondly, Hebrew grammar, and especially Hebrew syntax, has been much more comprehensively studied, and its principles far more accurately ascertained, than had been done in 1611. This, again, is partly due to the light thrown upon Hebrew by the study of the cognate dialects; but it is due, in a still larger measure, to the use of more exact modes of investigation, and to the growth of what may be termed a philological instinct, which, whether it deal with a classical language or with Hebrew, sympathises with, and strives to assimilate itself to, the spirit and modes of thought of the literature which it essays to understand. The mediæval Jewish commentators, though it may seem strange to say so, had a defective philological method, and possessed no insight into Hebrew syntax: tradition guided them as to the general meaning of particular passages; but it gave them next to no knowledge of Hebrew grammar. Hebrew grammar they had in consequence to reconstruct entirely for themselves. Their reconstruction lacked the necessary logical basis, and hence was imperfect. It is true Jewish tradition must always form the starting-point for the exegesis of the Old Testament; but if error is to be avoided it must at every step be checked and controlled by a rigorous application of the tests of scientific philology. And only the scholars of the last two generations have learnt what these are, and perceived how they must be applied. Thirdly, there are other ways by which, somewhat less directly, the exegesis of the Old Testament has been advanced. Archæological research, for instance, and travel have fixed the meaning of many terms which were formerly misunderstood. Still more is due to the awakening of the historical sense which has marked the present century. The effect of this has been that an ancient writing is viewed not merely as an aggregate of discontinuous texts, but as a whole; it is viewed as subserving a purpose in the age for which it was written and to which it is addressed. It is treated as embodying a consecutive argument, to which every detail and every part is subordinate. Having seized the purport of the whole, we have a clue to aid us in the interpretation of particular passages which may be in themselves ambiguous or obscure. The failure to seize the drift of an argument, be it only that of a single Psalm, and to express it consistently is a noticeable feature in the version of 1611; it is, perhaps, most conspicuous in some of the Epistles, but it is not less apparent in many parts of the Old Testament so soon as the attempt is made to grasp their real meaning. Modern commentaries bestow great pains upon elucidating the sequence of thought; and it is obvious that until this is clearly apprehended the full significance of a passage cannot be properly perceived. New discoveries in philology, improved philological methods, the growth of a finer exegetical instinct, and a higher sense of the aims of exegesis, which have been gradually acquired during the last two hundred and fifty years—these, speaking generally, are the grounds which have made a revision of the English version of the Old as of the New Testament appear to competent judges desirable and necessary.

II. In dealing with the difficulties of translation, I confine myself to those which are most prominent, and the existence of which both accounts for the absence of unanimity among scholars, and explains why an ideal translation of the Old Testament is not feasible. First, there are passages which are so out of harmony with the normal use of the language, that the suspicion—though its truth cannot always be demonstrated—forces itself upon us that the text has not been handed down to us in its original purity. An element of uncertainty is thus at once introduced; and the judgment of different scholars upon such passages will naturally vary. Secondly, a large part of the Old Testament is poetical; and the poetry of all languages, from the conditions which the temper of the poet, or the rules of his art, impose upon his choice of language, offers peculiar difficulties to the translator. Are there not passages, even in the poetry of our own language—even, for instance, in Shakespeare—on the interpretation of which the reader is uncertain and critics are divided? A modern scholar, moreover, must gain his knowledge of an ancient language from without; he must, by careful observation and induction, acquire a grasp of its laws; he must think himself into its modes of representation, and be in sympathy with its ideas and currents of thought. But whatever skill he may show in doing this he cannot feel uniformly the keen and quick response which a sentence uttered in his native tongue immediately evokes; hence, even where there is no ground to suspect corruption of the text, he often cannot seize the sense of some concise or pregnant poetical phrase with the same unerring certainty as those upon whose ears it first fell. Passages thus remain which the best and ablest scholars must continue to read differently; a particular interpretation may seem to ourselves preferable, but other scholars, who have approached the language in a slightly different direction, are impressed by a different set of parellelisms and analogies, and judge differently. To the imperfect, and hence varying appreciation, which is alone possible to those who thus approach a language from the outside—whether they be the authors of the ancient versions (who mostly had no knowledge of Hebrew as a living language), or the Jewish commentators of the Middle Ages (who, as I said, really read the Old Testament by an artificial method constructed afresh for themselves), or the philological critics of modern times—the variations between text and margin are largely due. There is generally no unanimity of tradition to appeal to in such cases; the earliest important Jewish commentator (of the eleventh century) construes the first verse in the Bible in a manner entirely different from that with which we are familiar. Thirdly, there are a number of rare words in the Old Testament, on the meaning of which tradition is divided, or is at variance with the evidence afforded by the sister dialects; or, again, on which the evidence of the dialects is not conclusive. Fourthly, Hebrew has many characteristic idioms and forms of expression which can often be only imperfectly represented in English. Numbers, genders, conjugations, tenses, all express gradations and shades of meaning which a person conversant with the original may *feel* as he reads the English version, but which in many cases cannot be conveyed to an ordinary reader except at the cost of violence to English modes of expression which more than counterbalances the gain. Hebrew, again, is peculiarly rich in synonyms, amongst the most important of which are those describing the emotions and different perceptive and reflective faculties. It is desirable in such cases to preserve the distinction if possible; but idiom, or usage, continually interposes with its unwelcome but inexorable veto. These considerations, while illustrating some of the difficulties with which the revising company has had to deal, will show at the same time that a perfect translation—a translation in which all scholars will coincide, is, and—so far as we can see—must remain, an unattainable ideal, and will further constitute some explanation of the frequent alternatives given in the margin. These alternatives (putting aside those that concern differences of reading, or are merely explanatory) express the divergent views on difficult passages which have been held through the causes which I have indicated by competent scholars, and which, where no one may presume to dogmatise, have a claim to be represented. The margin holds thus an important place in the New Version, and should on no account be neglected by the attentive reader. Whether in a given passage it is to be preferred to the rendering of the text must be determined by each for himself. Those who are Hebrew scholars, and able to form an opinion, will certainly be divided: they will sometimes think the rendering of the margin more consonant with the genius of the language, more favoured by analogy; they will in other cases judge similarly of the rendering in the text.

III. Is the revision a success? Stated in this form, the question is one which I cannot take upon me to answer. The success of such a work depends in large measure upon its literary qualities, which must be estimated by others; a member of the company itself cannot with propriety pronounce judgment upon them. But on the substantial question whether or not the new version is a more accurate representation of the original than the version of 1611, whether or not it is fairly on the level of modern scholarship, it may perhaps be permissible for me to pass an opinion. The subject is so broad and general, and the personal element consequently so inconsiderable, that I need not, I hope, feel myself debarred from expressing, at least in general terms, an opinion upon it. Much, indeed, is to be said in favour of a translation such as that of the Psalms by Mr. Cheyne, in which conventional phrases are abandoned, and the author's meaning is brought home to the reader with an incisiveness and force, yet with perfect adherence to idiom, which the style of the Authorised Version does not possess. But the intention of the revision was not to supplant the Authorised Version by a fresh translation, but to readjust the old version to modern needs. From this point of view I think it may be said that the Revised Version has accomplished what was desired. A translation which should reflect every one's perception of the Hebrew original is, from the nature of the case, unattainable; unless, therefore, we each frame an ideal translation for our own use, for which, as I venture to think, the time is not yet ripe, we must acquiesce in the best translation possible under the circumstances. I claim this character for the new version. I know that it contains renderings with which I disagree: I know also that there are cases in which I would gladly have seen what is now in the margin introduced into the text; but I know besides that for one rendering in the Revised Version with which (perhaps wrongly) I disagree, there are ten in the Authorised Version which I am sure are positively incorrect and misleading, and a hundred where, though serious error cannot be imputed, the sense is more accurately and faithfully reflected in the Revised Version. All who have studied closely, say, for example, the Book of Isaiah in the Authorised Version, know that in parts verse after verse has to be altered and corrected before the true meaning of the prophet, or even the general drift of his argument, can be apprehended. We open any modern English commentary and find similar corrections in the footnotes upon every page. I say this in no depreciation of the merits of King James's translators; the blemishes upon their work, such as they are, are due to no fault or neglect on their part; they are simply revealed by the march of time. But it seems to me to be only reasonable and just that the true sense of the Hebrew Scriptures, so far as it can be ascertained, should not be hidden away in massive or voluminous commentaries, or reserved for the special use of students in theology, but be made known generally and read publicly before the people. No version can perfectly satisfy every one; but if we are reasonable critics, we shall waive individual and partial objections for the sake of the general gain. The opinion which I have seen expressed that the new version merely confirms the substantial accuracy of the Authorised Version seems to me to be a superficial one, readily capable of being misapplied. As an argument, for instance, against the use of the Revised Version, it might have been urged similarly against the introduction of King James's Version itself. The Genevan and Bishops' Bibles were *substantially* accurate translations; nevertheless, King James's Version was an improvement upon them and deserved to take their place. As a body, I believe I may say without impropriety, the Old Testament revisers sought to sink their own individuality, and to act as they believed King James's translators would have acted had they lived in the present day and enjoyed the philological resources now made accessible to scholars. If, therefore, the verdict of literary critics be favourable, I do not think that the Revised Version (of which the margins must be regarded as forming an integral part) should be viewed with distrust upon grounds of philology and scholarship; I think that it deserves to be brought into general use.

The Oxford Professor was followed by his Cambridge brother, Canon Kirkpatrick:—

The Bishop of Bath and Wells and Professor Driver, as having themselves been members of the Revision Company, have naturally been silent about the thanks due to them for their own labours. I hope that I shall be giving expression, not to my own feelings, but those of this Congress, if I venture to say that to that company, of which our revered President was the chairman, a very deep debt of gratitude is due for their arduous and self-denying labours. I am confident that those labours will (to use the Revisers' own words, in their preface), "with God's blessing, tend to a clearer knowledge of the Old Testament Scriptures;" and that will be their truest reward. In fidelity and lucidity the Revised Version is vastly superior to the Authorised Version. Am I too sanguine if I think that, when we come to be familiar with it, we shall find it not so very much less enjoyable? I am not optimist enough to think that it is perfect; probably the revisers would be the first to admit its imperfections. But whatever those imperfections may be, a noble and thankworthy task has been accomplished, of which the century may well be proud.

From the title-page of the Revised Version we learn that it is "the Version set forth A.D. 1611, compared with the most ancient authorities, and revised." The important words, "compared with the most ancient authorities," may be understood to refer chiefly to the underlying text upon which the Version is based; and it is to this question of Text that I propose to address myself in the present paper.

The Revisers state in their Preface that they have thought it most prudent to adopt the Received, or, as it is commonly called, the Massoretic Text, as the basis of their work, and to depart from it, as the Authorised translators had done, only in exceptional cases. These exceptional cases, in which the reading of an ancient Version has been adopted instead of the reading of the Massoretic Text, are considerably more numerous in the Revised than in the Authorised Version; and, with rare exceptions (*e.g.*, 1 Sam. xxx. 2), the fact is duly noted in the margin. But the Revisers have taken a further step, which is distinctly a new departure. They have placed in the margin a number of alternative readings from the Ancient Versions. This can only mean that in these cases they believe that the Hebrew text is doubtful, and that the true reading is not improbably that which they have placed in the margin.

Were they justified in thus casting doubt upon the integrity of the Hebrew text? The history and character of that text will furnish the answer. The Hebrew text has come down to us in MSS., of which none are certainly older than the beginning of the tenth century A.D. They all concur in giving the same text, with comparatively unimportant variations.

There are, it is true, certain recognised various readings in the MSS. One word is given in the text, and another in the margin. The Jewish tradition prescribes that the marginal reading, which is called the *K'ri* (*i.e.*, *read*), should be substituted for the textual reading, which is called the *C'thib* (*i.e.*, *written*). But these alternative readings are given in all the MSS, and we have no means of deciding whether text or margin is right, except internal evidence and the evidence of the Ancient Versions. Some of the most interesting changes in the Revised Version are due to the adoption of the *K'ri* where the Authorised translators had followed the *C'thib*, or *vice versâ*. Thus in Job xiii. 15, the rendering in the text, "Though He slay me, yet will I wait for Him" (Authorised Version, "trust in Him"), follows the *K'ri*; those in the margin, "Behold, He will slay me, I will not wait," or, "I have no hope," follow the *C'thib*. In Ps. c. 3, the Revised Version, "It is He that hath made us, and we are His," which, I think, we must all admit to be a great improvement upon "not we ourselves" in the Authorised Version, is due to the adoption of the *K'ri*. "Thou hast multiplied the nation, Thou hast increased their joy," which is now rightly read in place of "Thou hast multiplied the nation, and not increased the joy" (Is. ix. 3), which jars like a strange discord across the triumphant joyousness of our Christmas lesson, is due to the same cause. In all three cases the difference is owing to a confusion between the Hebrew words for *not* and *to him* (or *to it*), which are sounded alike (*lō*), though spelt differently.

But to return. To what is the unanimity of the Hebrew MSS. due? Is it due to the jealous care with which the Jewish scribes have preserved the sacred text from the very first? or is it rather due to their having, at some time or other, settled upon a form of text which came to be adopted as the authoritative standard, to the exclusion of all variations? In the first case, the text would be perfect, needing little or no correction; and this is the view of orthodox Jews, and of some Christians. It was the dominant view in the seventeenth century, and therefore, with rare exceptions, the Authorised Version adheres closely to the Massoretic Text. In the second case, the text *may* contain many serious errors, which already existed in the MSS. from which the scribes formed their recension; and this is the view of most modern scholars. There is evidence tending to show that the standard text or recension was formed about the end of the first century A.D. Since then it has been preserved with scrupulous care, and has probably suffered little change; but before that time there can be no doubt that, partly by intention,* and partly by accident, numerous alterations and errors had found their way into the text. The character of the text in the different books differs greatly. The Pentateuch is best preserved; the Books of Samuel and Ezekiel are about the most corrupt.

To question the integrity of the Hebrew text is neither irreverent nor unreasonable. It is not irreverent: we know that it has not been God's will to preserve the New Testament from change and corruption: and there is no reason why He should have dealt differently with the Old Testament. It is not unreasonable; for the text of the Old Testament has been exposed to singular vicissitudes in the course of its history. Most if not all of the books were originally written in the old Hebrew or Phœnician character—a character in which many of the letters are specially liable to confusion. It is extremely probable that many errors crept in during the transition from this character to the "square" character now in use, which took place between the time of Ezra and our Lord's time. Hebrew, moreover, like

* Examples of intentional changes are the substitution of *Manasseh* for *Moses*, in Jud. xviii. 30, to avoid the supposed disgrace to Moses of an apostate descendant; the change of *Eshbaal* for *Ishbosheth*, to avoid pronouncing the name *Baal*, or the deletion of the word altogether, as in 2 Sam. iv. 2, where it has carried away the preposition necessary to express *had*, and made the sentence, as it stands, meaningless; and perhaps the substitution of "the enemies of David" for "David," in 1 Sam. xx. 16; xxv. 22.

other Oriental languages, was originally written, as the rolls for Synagogue use still are, without vowels. The vowels were not added to the text until the seventh or eighth century A.D.; and though they certainly represent a much older tradition as to the correct way of reading the consonants, they cannot be regarded as possessing an absolute authority.

But the question of the integrity of the Hebrew text is not one of probabilities. When we come to interrogate the text itself, it is clear beyond question that it contains many serious errors. The proof of this charge lies in the following facts:—(1) There are many passages in which the text, as it stands, cannot be translated without doing violence to the laws of grammar (*e.g.*, Gen. iv. 8; Josh. iv. 24; 1 Sam. vi. 18; Ps. xvi. 2; Jer. xi. 15), or is irreconcilable with the context, or with other passages (*e.g.*, 2 Sam. xxi. 8; Hos. xi. 5). (2) Passages which are found in more than one book, and are evidently derived one from the other, or from a common original, differ in such a way as to make it clear that the variations are due largely to accidental corruption, though in part also to intentional change (*e.g.*, 2 Sam. xxi. 18 ff., compared with 1 Chron. xx. 4 ff.; 2 Sam. xxi., and Ps. xviii.; 2 Kings xviii., xix., and 1 Isaiah xxxvi., xxxvii.; Ps. xiv. and iii.). The Ancient Versions contain various readings, which in many cases bear a strong stamp of probabilty upon them, and often lessen or remove the difficulties of the Hebrew text.

If, then, the antecedents of the Hebrew text make its non-integrity probable, and it is found upon investigation that it bears internal marks of corruption, how is it to be corrected? The Hebrew MSS. give no help, for they all agree in the same false readings. Almost the only available aid is that of the ancient Versions, particularly the Septuagint Version, which was begun nearly twelve centuries before the earliest extant Hebrew MSS. were written. It should be clearly understood that the Hebrew text, as a whole, is decidedly superior to that of any of the Versions; but where this text is evidently defective, it is right to appeal to the Versions, and see whether they do not offer the means of emending it. And, further, even where the Hebrew text is not in itself suspicious, but some of the Versions have a different reading, the possibility that this is the original reading must be taken into account.

In some cases cases, where is reason to suspect corruption antecedent to any existing authority resort must be had even to conjecture. [The Authorised Version and Revised Version both resort to conjecture in Jud. ii. 3, inserting the words *as thorns*, from Num. xxxiii. 55. See also Prov. vii. (Authorised Version).]

On general principles, then, you may be fully assured that the Revisers were thoroughly justified in occasionally adopting readings from Ancient Versions in preference to the Massoretic Text; and that the various readings from Versions given in the margin are the expression of legitimate doubt as to whether the true original has been preserved in the Hebrew Text. I am very much surprised to see that the American Company would prefer to exclude them altogether. Opinions may differ as to particular passages, but the general principle is undeniably sound, that in the Old Testament recourse must be had to the Versions for the correction of the Massoretic Text.

Let me take one or two examples of corrections introduced into the text of the Revised Version. According to the Hebrew text of 1 Chron. vi. 28, the sons of Samuel were "the firstborn Vashni, and Abiah." The form of the sentence and the name *Vashni* are suspicious; and in 1 Sam. viii. 2, the names of Samuel's sons are given as Joel and Abiah. There is no doubt that in 1 Chron. *Vashni* is simply a corruption for the Hebrew word meaning *and the second*; and the Revisers have rightly followed the Syriac Version in restoring Joel's name, and reading, "the firstborn Joel, and the second Abiah." The next case I will take is Psalm xxii, 16; those solemn words which we rightly understand as foreshadowing the sufferings of our Blessed Lord upon the Cross: "They pierced my hands and my feet." The Hebrew text, as now pointed, reads "like a lion" for the word corresponding to "they pierced," and a verb must be supplied from the earlier part of the verse, thus: "Like a lion (they compassed about) my hands and my feet." That is not satisfactory; but all the ancient versions represent a verb, though they translate it in various ways; and the Revisers were undoubtedly right in doing as the Authorised translators had done before them, and following the Septuagint and some other Versions in reading "they pierced."

The various readings in the margin deserve careful study. Take for example that in Gen. xxxii. 28, which makes the Angel's words to Jacob a distinct encouragement in view of the dreaded meeting with Esau: "Thou hast had power with God, and thou shalt prevail against men;" or that in 1 Sam. xii. 3, interesting because it is referred to as early as the book of Ecclesiasticus (xlvi. 19): "Of whose hands have I taken a bribe, even a pair of shoes? answer against me"; or that in 1 Sam. xiv. 18, which makes Saul bid Ahijah, the priest, bring not the Ark but the ephod, which certainly was the instrument generally used for inquiring of God; or the important omissions in 1 Sam. xvii., which remove so many difficulties in the narrative of David's introduction to Saul; or the curious particulars about the murder of Ish-bosheth in 2 Sam. iv. 16; and a multitude of others which might be mentioned. If they cannot be proved to be certainly right, they have at any rate strong claims for careful consideration.

But the further question must be asked, Have the Revisers done all that might have been expected for the correction of the text?

It is, I believe, a matter for regret, that they have not (1) introduced into the text many of the readings which they have only placed in the margin; (2) placed in the margin a number of other readings which have at least as good a claim to admission; (3) frankly admitted more often than they have done that the Hebrew text is corrupt, and that we have no certain means of restoring it.

(1) Let me give some examples of marginal readings which should have been introduced into the text. In Gen. iv. 8, the words "And Cain said unto Abel his brother," require the speaker's words to follow; and the addition found in several Versions, "Let us go into the field," not only supplies this defect, but explains v. 9, "And it came to pass *when they were in the field*, that Cain rose up against Abel his brother, and slew him." In Gen. xlvii. 21, it is very doubtful whether the words, "As for the people, he removed them to the cities from one end of the border of Egypt even to the other end thereof," can legitimately be understood of a general removal of the people from the country to the cities where the corn was stored; whereas the reading of the Septuagint and other authorities, "he made bondmen of them," agrees exactly with the request of the people in v. 18, "buy *us* and our land for bread." In 2 Sam. xv. 7, "four" makes sense, and "forty" does does; Absalom could not have been hatching his rebellion for forty years. In Ps. xx. 9, the reading of the versions, "O Lord, save the King; and answer us when we call," is required by both rhythm and context; and the absolute use of "the King" for "God" in the reading of the text, "Let the King answer us when we call," is without parallel. In Ps. xlii. 5, 6, the touching refrain, "Hope thou in God; for I shall yet praise Him who is the health of my countenance, and my God," which recurs in v. 11 and in xliii. 5, should certainly have been restored. In Hos. vi. 5, "My judgement goeth forth as the light," is certainly preferable to "Thy judgments are as the light that goeth forth;" and it is hard to believe that in Hos. xiv. 2, "So will we render (as) bullocks (the offering of) our lips," should not give way to "So will we render the fruit of our lips."

(2) It was no doubt necessary to make some selection of various readings for the margin; but many which seem to have a good right to appear there, if not in the text, are passed over altogether. For example, after Josh. xv. 59, the Septuagint adds another group of eleven cities, containing such well-known places as Bethlehem and Tekoa, the omission of which from the catalogue of places would be very strange. The Septuagint omissions in 1 Samuel xviii. are as noteworthy as those in chap. xvii., but, with the exception of verses 1-5, they are ignored. No notice is taken of the fact that in 2 Sam. xxiv. 13, the Septuagint agrees with 1 Chron. xxi. 12, in reading *three* for *seven* years of famine. The additions and omissions of the Septuagint in the Book of Proverbs are remarkable, but they are entirely passed over. The reading of the text in Hos. xi. 5, "He shall not return to the land of Egypt," is not only pointless, but inconsistent with the declaration of chap. viii. 13, "They shall return to Egypt," and with other passages (ix. 3, 6; xi. 11); but we have no hint that the Septuagint, although rendering wrongly, supports the reading, "He shall return," which is what the context requires. These are but a few instances out of many. (See Josh. vi. 18; xix. 47; 1 Sam. ix. 8; xiv. 41; xviii. 28 ("all Israel" of the Septuagint must be read in place of "Michal, Saul's daughter"); xxxi. 9; 2 Sam. vi. 1-5; vii. 16, 23 (strong cases); xii. 6; xix. 11; Hos. x. 13.

(3) In some few cases, where no satisfactory help is obtainable from the Versions, the Revisers note in the margin that the Hebrew text is obscure, corrupt, or faulty. This should have been done oftener. In 1 Sam. xiii. 1, for example, the Hebrew text reads, "Saul was [—] years old when he began to reign; and he reigned [— and] two years over Israel." The words are the common formula for denoting the age of a king at his accession, and the length of his reign. But either the numerals have dropped out, or more probably they were never inserted. The Revisers have inserted *thirty* in brackets, from some MSS. of the Septuagint, but this is only half a correction. Saul must have reigned more than two years, and even if (which is doubtful) the two years could be understood to refer to the time which had elapsed since his accession before the events recorded in the chapter, that interpretation is at once negatived by the fact that his son Jonathan appears as a stalwart warrior. The whole verse ought to have been enclosed in brackets, for it had no place in the original Septuagint; or, at any rate, a statement should have been made that the second numeral, as well as the first, is wholly uncertain. The corruption of the text in 2 Sam. xxi. 18ff., which is clear from a comparison of the parallel in 1 Chron. xx. 4ff., should have been acknowledged, and readers should not have been left to puzzle themselves in a vain endeavour to reconcile discrepancies which are due to the carelessness of scribes, or to the accidental obliteration of words in the MSS. from which they were copying.

In conclusion, the Revisers, by their introduction of readings from the Versions, have accepted the important principle that the imperfection of the Massoretic Text must be admitted, and the Versions employed to correct it. But I venture to think that they have not been sufficiently bold and thorough in their application of the principle. Though it is true that, as the Revisers say in their Preface, the state of our knowledge "is not at present such as to justify any attempt at an entire reconstruction of the text on the authority of the Versions," more corrections might well have been introduced into the text, and more readings which are at least probable might have found a place in the margin.

But why, some will say, unsettle simple minds by casting doubt on the integrity of the text in a version intended for popular use? (1) Honesty requires it. The cause of Truth is ill served by concealing facts, or affirming uncertainties to be certainties, whether of reading or rendering. It is only fair that English readers should be informed if there is doubt as to the true reading of a passage, as well as if there is doubt as to its correct rendering, and so warned not to use it in argument without further inquiry. (2) To maintain the absolute integrity of the Massoretic Text is to load the Old Testament with a burden heavier than it can bear. There are real difficulties enough in it, without the addition of those adventitious difficulties which arise from the corruption of the text.

We seek to learn Divine truth from the Holy Scriptures. Sober and reverent criticism is not our enemy, but our ally in the search.

The Rev. Dr. C. H. H. Wright followed:—

In a work of such magnitude as the Revised Version of the Old Testament, every scholar must necessarily come across translations which fail to commend themselves to his judgment. But few will deny that the work accomplished by the Old Testament Company is most valuable. It may be said to be generally conceded that the New Translation, as a whole, is much superior to the Authorised Version; and I fully endorse this opinion.

Everyone admits that the Books of the Old Testament require considerable study before their meaning in particular passages can be ascertained. Yet a common objection has been brought against the New Version that the ordinary reader will, in a few cases, be unable at once to comprehend its meaning. It would, indeed, be strange if books originally written in the East, under peculiar conditions, and circumstances widely different from our own, could be understood by Western readers without any exercise of study or thought. The fallacy that the Bible is in all parts easy of comprehension underlies, however, not a few of the critiques written already on the Revised Version.

Some of these exhibit a singular want of reflection. One critic, for instance, ventures to ask what object the Revisers had in view when they altered the rendering "set a mark upon Cain" into "appointed a sign for Cain." A moment's reflection would have enabled him to answer the question. The statement of the Book of Genesis was often explained to refer to a mark impressed on Cain's forehead or countenance. The Revised Version has correctly explained the passage as stating that some sign, whether in the heaven above or in the earth beneath, was vouchsafed to Cain in confirmation of the Divine promise. The sacred text does not, indeed, state why such a sign should have been necessary, for it gives us no information as the mode in which the Almighty then revealed Himself to man.

Complaints have been made against the introduction of new words into the text, such as Sheol, Abaddon, Asherah, Asherim, &c. But this will prove an advantage if readers of the Bible are thereby compelled to take a little trouble at first to understand technical terms for which there are really no proper English equivalents. The use of common words, such as "hell," in different significations in the Authorised Version, has often led to serious theological misunderstandings.

The Song of Lamech is more intelligible in the Revised than in the Authorised Version. But it is to be feared that the real significance of that song will be missed by the average reader, unless he receives a hint that the sacred writer inserted that "song of the sword" to show the daring impiety of the race which perished in the waters of the Deluge.

Though the Massoretic scholars of old rendered most important services in the preservation of the Hebrew text, the very occurrence of the strange name "Dammesek Eliezer," in Gen. xv. 2 (which has been rashly condemned as a piece of pedantry), may of itself call attention to the fact that the Hebrew text is by no means immaculate, of which fact numerous instances could be cited from the historical books of Samuel, Kings, and Chronicles. In the passage alluded to, the Revisers have followed the LXX. and Vulg., who regard the strange compound as a proper name. The original text is probably here corrupt. But it would not have been right to have silently corrected the passage by translating "Eliezer of Damascus," as was done, perhaps unwittingly, in the Authorised Version, after the example of the Chald. and the Syriac.

Many would-be critics have made merry over the translation "the caperberry shall fail" (Eccles. xii. 5). But it is almost certain that the rendering "desire shall fail," given in the Authorised Version, is philologically impossible. I am not, however, satisfied with the conservatism exhibited in the revision of that chapter, and protest against the general assumption that the song contained therein is a description of man's decay in old age.

It is, perhaps, "unsavoury," to render 1 Kings xxii. 38, "and they washed the chariot by the pool of Samaria, and the dogs licked up his blood (now the harlots washed themselves there); according to the word of the Lord which he spoke." But the new translation is correct, while the old is a mistranslation. The significance of the narrative is that the blood of Ahab, who had reared up altars to Baal and Ashtaroth (1 Kings xvi. 32, 33), was not only licked up by dogs, but was actually sprinkled on the bodies of women who prostituted themselves in honour of the goddess, as it polluted the water in which they bathed.

The value of the Revised Version will be seriously diminished if the marginal renderings are neglected. But it has been affirmed that while the text of the New Version exhibits a disposition to adhere to the doctrines of the Church, and to avoid all appearance of antagonism to the New Testament, the marginal renderings show a different spirit, and tend decidedly to weaken the testimony of the Old Testament to Christ. The Jewish newspapers in England have already claimed the Revision of the Old Testament as a triumph of Jewish over Christian scholarship, and have even ventured to assert that "the Christology of the Old Testament practically disappears in the New Version, though the Revisers have not had the courage to recognise the fact."

The language of the Jewish press on this subject is to be received with caution. If such an impression were to gain ground, serious damage would be done, not merely to the interests of the New Version, but to those of Christianity. The Revision of the Old Testament has no more injured Christology than geological science has overturned the Book of Genesis. A few texts which, incorrectly translated, have been erroneously regarded as prophecies of Christ, have, indeed, disappeared even in the text of the New Version; and other passages, though really Messianic, have, owing to the variations between the text and the margin, lost some of their apparent evidencial value. But this is not the first time that a similar event has occurred without any detriment accruing to the true cause of Christianity. No inconsiderable number of texts once quoted as Messianic (owing to the use of the LXX. Version, in Patristic days), have long ago ceased to be brought forward in controversy with Jews or heretics. Much injury will be done now to the cause of Christianity if Christian advocates, by a clamour against the Revised Version, practically acknowledge their inability to prove the Messiahship of Jesus from an honest and impartial translation of the Old Testament. Christianity will be injured if any considerable body of the clergy in the Nineteenth Century venture to lay down the principle that the Revisers were bound to translate the Old Testament in such a manner as to accord with the doctrines of the Church, and to conceal from the light of day any variations which might exist between the Scriptures of the Old and New Testament. The warning of the patriarch should never be forgotten: "Will ye speak unrighteously for God, and talk deceitfully for Him" (Job xiii. 7).

If we maintain that the supernatural and predictive element can be proved to exist in the Old Testament, we ought frankly to abandon any renderings which can be shown to be incorrect by the light of modern scholarship. The weakest point of true Christianity is strong enough to repel the foe. We are not alarmed to observe that while the word *bwire* is retained in the text of Gen. iii. 15, the rendering *lie in wait* has found a place in the margin. The reference of the passage to Christ is not thereby endangered. The Messianic character of Gen. xlix. 10 (a passage nowhere alluded to in the New Testament), is not destroyed, even though in place of "until Shiloh shall come," the margin has an alternative "until he come to Shiloh." No critic can deny that the latter rendering, viewed exclusively from a grammatical and philological point of view, is more defensible than the former. The strength of the Messianic interpretation lies in the clause, "unto him shall be the obedience of the peoples," for it is only in the person of Messiah that the nations yield obedience to the tribe of Judah. The still small voice of the dying patriarch has been re-echoed in the shout of the later prophets, proclaiming on the mountains the King of Zion as King of Kings.

In Haggai ii. 7, the Messianic prediction is contained in the clause, "I will fill this house with glory," a thought expanded by the later prophet, "the Lord whom he seek shall suddenly come to his temple" (Mal. iii., 1), and strikingly illustrated by the *Nunc Dimittis* of devout Simeon (Luke ii. 25). No honest band of Revisers could have avoided the alteration of the clause, "the desire of all nations shall come," into "the desirable things of all nations shall come," the "desirable things" referred to being unquestionably the presents and gifts from the Kings of the Gentiles spoken of in the 72nd Psalm.

The Christian apologist must learn to quote texts which can endure the brunt of controversy. It would be useless to equip soldiers with arms which might be shivered in the first combat. A new age requires new weapons, and on the Christian battle-field the old truths, as certain as ever, must be defended by arguments in some respects new. The importance of the old principle, too often forgotten, is more clearly coming into view, that the revelation of Christ to the prophets of Israel was not only made "in divers manners" but "by divers portions" (Heb. i. 1).

In the infancy of Biblical criticism it would have been considered unorthodox to translate Psalms viii. 5, as in the Revised Version, by "Thou hast made him but little lower than God," for such a rendering was supposed to endanger New Testament authority. It has, however, long since been acknowledged that the Epistle to the Hebrews loses nothing by the adoption in the Psalm of the most natural rendering. We have now got a little beyond the stage in which men sought to counteract geological heresies by such translations as "in the beginning God created the substance of the heavens and the substance of the earth," and to uphold the Divinity of the Messiah by inventing in its favour the no less erroneous translation of Eve's exclamation at the birth of Cain (Gen. iv. 1), "I have gotten me the man Jehovah."

It is important to observe that the Messianic interpretation of the Second Psalm remains quite unaffected by any of the translations given in the margin of verse 12, as alternatives for "kiss the son," renderings unfairly ascribed to the spirit of rationalism. The 12th verse is nowhere referred to in the New Testament, and the correct reading of the Hebrew text is very doubtful. But the key of the Messianic position is verse 7, which is frequently quoted in the New Testament, and the translation of which is not open to dispute. It is unwise to seek to defend positions which are unquestionably weak, when the citadel is so strong.

I cannot notice various interesting points connected with the revised translation of Psalm xvi. and xxii., but it is perfectly safe to affirm that the Messianic interpretation of those Psalms, and the authority of the New Testament Scriptures, would not be imperilled by the adoption of any of the marginal renderings of the Revised Version.

The marginal rendering of Psalm xlv. 6 has also been pointed to as savouring of rationalism. I maintain that the translation "Thy throne, O God, is for ever and ever," is the only admissible rendering. But common honesty compelled the Revisers to give on the margin the alternative rendering, which has often been supported by eminent scholars. The argument of the sacred writer in the Epistle to the Hebrews (ch. i. 8, 9), which rests on the passage, would, no doubt (if the marginal translation were adopted), be reduced to an *argumentum ad hominem*. But, even in that case, the truth which the epistle seeks to establish would not itself be imperilled.

In Psalm cx. a prophecy of the very highest importance, the Messianic interpretation has lost nothing of significance by the word "lord" ("my lord") being deprived of its capital letter. The force of the Psalm as applicable to Christ is more clearly and correctly brought out in the New Version than in the Old.

The study of the Revised Version will tend to correct many popular misrepresentations of the Sacred Text. The rendering in Isaiah xxxiii. 17, "a far-stretching land," referring to the Holy Land as freed from the Assyrian invaders, and stretching out on every side far and wide, may, though the Old Version is in this place perfectly defensible, lead the student to see that "the king in his beauty" does not mean Jehovah or Messiah but Hezekiah. The Messianic sense of the beautiful prophecy of the Shepherd and his flock, in Ezek. xxxiv., is not obscured in the New Version; but the correction of "Plant of renown," in v. 29, into "plantation of renown," will lead the reader to see that in that verse the prophet is speaking of the fruitfulness of the land in the day when Messiah shall be acknowledged as King. In the prophecy of Christ as the Prince of Peace (Is. ix. 5) the Revised Version shows that the passage makes no reference to a future battle, fiercer than any which has occurred on earth's encrimsoned plains, but—in place of depicting "the day of wrath" spoken of in Psalm cx.—introduces a scene like that of Zech. ix. 10, in which the sword and the battle-bow are broken, and the armour and blood-stained garments are burned; for "nation shall not lift up sword against nation, neither shall they learn war any more," when the Kingdom of the Prince of Peace shall be established. The rendering, too, of Zech. xiii. 6, "what are these wounds between thine arms?" though less literal than that of the Authorised Version, may help to warn the reader against the offensive application to the wounds of Christ on the cross of a passage which speaks of wounds inflicted by a false prophet on himself in the worship of his idols. The application of the passage to Christ has been rightly rejected, even by the best Roman Catholic critics of modern times.

Nor ought the translation "the maiden," in place of "a virgin," in Isaiah vii. 14, to be viewed as hostile to Christianity. Though we maintain the correctness of the interpretation put upon that text in the New Testament, it is clear that the men of Isaiah's days would not thus have understood the passage. The delicacy with which this subject is handled in the New Testament (especially as contrasted with the Apocryphal writings), the manner in which men were led to believe in Jesus as the Christ, the Son of the living God, before their attention was drawn to the mystery connected with His incarnation, the mode in which the resurrection of Christ was ever insisted on as "the sign" given to the men of that generation, while that which from its very nature could only be "a sign" to believers, and not to unbelievers, is seldom referred to, and never brought into controversy, are to my mind some of the most remarkable phenomena of early Christianity. The mystery lay concealed in the words of the Old Testament prophet: it has been brought to light in the New Testament.

I close, not for want of matter, but for want of time. My arguments are, perhaps, too curt to convince opponents. I can only protest against any attempt to decry the Revised Version as likely in any of its parts to endanger "the faith once delivered to the saints." I venture to express the hope that the New Version may win the confidence of Churchmen, and at no distant day may be authorised to be read in our churches.

Archdeacon Palmer, in the course of his address, said:—

The only grounds on which I can defend my acceptance of a place among the speakers on this subject are two—one is that in past years I have devoted a good deal of time to the study of Hebrew: the other that I have had experience of a Reviser's work. I have had the privilege of taking part in the revision of the New Testament and of the Apocrypha, though not in the revision of the canonical books of the Old Testament. My study of Hebrew has enabled me to form some opinion for myself on the merits of the work which is under discussion. My experience as a Reviser puts me in a position to appreciate the difficulties of revision and to understand, more or less, the methods adopted by the Revisers of the Old Testament. I must con-

fess that I have not compared the Revised Version from end to end with the Hebrew original. I have compared, however, with the Hebrew selected portions of this version. I have compared portions of considerable extent with the Authorised Version, and I have read a very large part of the Revised Version itself continuously. Three points have struck me in this examination—first, the conscientious labour which has been bestowed on the work; secondly, the conservative spirit of the Revisers; and, thirdly, the general felicity of their diction. First, a careful reader cannot fail to observe that every verse, every sentence, I had almost said almost every stop, had been reconsidered. If he keeps the Authorised Version by the side of the Revised while he is reading, or if long use has given the words of the Authorised Version an abiding place in his memory, he will notice minute changes as well as changes of importance, which prove incontestably the diligence of the reviewers. Secondly, the work has been done in a spirit eminently conservative. The Revisers seem to have been anxious to make their emendations as few as possible. They have been unwilling to retranslate in any case in which the old translation was tolerable. I am sure that this policy will recommend their work to a large part of the public. Thirdly, the changes which the Revisers have made are for the most part felicitous in diction. They are perspicuous, they are graceful, and they do not spoil the rhythm of the passages in which they occur. If I were asked to name one book by which the diction of the Revisers might be tried, I should be inclined to name the Psalms. In elegance, as well as in accuracy, I have seemed to myself to find the Revised Version here decidedly superior to the Authorised Version, and I have found very few places in which new words or new turns of expression seemed to me unhappy.

The Rev. Canon MEYRICK dissented from the eulogiums which had been pronounced on the new New Version, and expressed a hope that the Revised Versions, both of the Old and New Testaments, if they were to be accepted by the Church of England, would be revised once more by a committee appointed by Convocation.

The Rev. J. F. BATEMAN took exception to some of the unnecessary alterations made by the Revisers, and the PRESIDENT, in closing the discussion, said that as a member of the Revision Company he was gratified with the kindly criticisms passed upon their work. On the whole, perhaps they had been too conservative, but it was safer to be too conservative than to err in the opposite direction. They wanted to obtain a version which would be intelligible to the English people, and they tried as far as they could to give the right meaning to every passage. They believed that the language of the version of 1611 was almost perfect English, and they had departed from it no more than they could possibly avoid. Wherever it was found necessary to introduce modern words care was taken to choose only those for which there was good authority. Although they had been Conservative the Revisers had not sacrificed accuracy, and they were thankful that their work had been received so favourably by the Congress and by the English public.

At the evening meeting

SPECIAL CHURCHWORK AMONG YOUNG MEN

was discussed.

The Rev. GEORGE EVERARD read a paper "On Churchwork among Young Men, with especial reference to the Time between School and Marriage." He said that in the first century the conversion of one young man gave a mighty impetus to the Church of Christ. The conversion of Saul of Tarsus repaired the breach caused by the death of Stephen, saved from cruel persecution the little flock at Damascus, gave a marked evidence of the truth of the Gospel, and raised up an agent fitted to carry the olive branch of peace to the confines of the civilised world. In the fourth century the conversion of one young man had no less blessed a result. Augustine, given to a mother's prayers, filled with zeal for Divine truth, proved a bulwark against heresy and paganism, and left his mark on all succeeding ages. In the sixteenth century a young man, a zealous young monk, finding a Bible in the monastery, received the truth into his heart, and came forth in face of fiery persecution as an instrument in the hand of the Most High for dispelling the dark shadows that encompassed Christendom, and for giving back the truth of a free justification received by the hand of faith, as apostles and evangelists had taught it fifteen centuries before. And in the nineteenth century the conversion of one young man has more than once affected the welfare of the whole Church. Teach one young man right and you do a great work. You take one who might have proved a curse to hundreds of his fellows and make him more or less a worker for righteousness and the kingdom of God. Very pressing was the need for such in the Church of Christ. Openings for Christian work abounded in all directions, both at home and abroad. The question of the great social evil was thrust upon us wisely or unwisely, and we could not avoid it. Infidelity and agnosticism were never more aggressive. Dangers and difficulties beset the Church on all hands. For all these things was wanted, above all, the help of young men of fixed principles, of zeal and courage rooted in the faith, and staunch in their attachment to the Church of England, cleaving to the Book of Common Prayer, and holding fast those Reformation principles that underlay every part of it. Two foundation principles as to Christ's work among young men met us at the outset—first, aim at nothing short of heart-conversion to God; and, as a second principle, get true workers. Plans and systems were important, but all would fail without the right men to carry them out. By all means let them have their association, but let them give their heart to this, to get right men to carry it on. Who would volunteer? There was no nobler field on which to expend whatever gifts they possessed; there was none more fruitful or more likely to yield a glorious harvest. It was also important to bear in mind in this work the immense vantage ground of total abstinence from intoxicating liquors.

Mr. W. INGLIS read a paper on "Working Men's Associations in Town and Country." He deprecated the starting of working-men's clubs over the heads of the members as was too frequently done, and referred to the work being done by the association of which he was the President—namely, the Church of England Working Men's Society. Several of the Church of England Working Men's Societies had reading-rooms with a supply of papers and well-selected libraries. In London many of the members were engaged, some in visiting and holding simple services in lodging-houses, or going among the slums singing hymns, and cordially inviting the people to special mission services, whilst in the provinces more than one branch carried on vigorous missions under the auspices and with the consent of the clergy. A lecture and instruction section was desirable, which would organise lectures and distribute literature on this subject. In this work the Church of England Working Men's Society had distributed 280,000 leaflets during the past year, and held 2,164 meetings. If cleanliness was next to godliness, they must first roll away the great stone that barred the way to human improvement before there could be pure homes and moral lives. Another useful means of protection was providing healthy innocent amusements that would elevate the tastes of the people and lead them to desire something better than the low music-hall or the penny gaff. By such machinery, well organised, much effective work would be done, and by bringing rich and poor members in contact with each other as fellow-workers the barrier that still separated them would be beaten down, with advantage to both. The poor would learn that the rich were not what demagogues had taught them, mere selfish devourers of other men's labours whilst contributing nothing to the Commonwealth themselves; and the rich would see that the working-classes were not what they had pictured them, a discontented, revolutionary race, but gifted, like themselves, with all the instincts of the gentleman. As members of that Society, or of any other of the many unions for Church work, if men were to be useful they must work upon honest Church lines, walk in the old paths, cast aside all narrowness, and become as comprehensive as the Church itself. They must draw nearer to each other as brothers, tear up the ticketed names High Church, Low Church, and Broad Church, and rally under the grand old banner inscribed "The Catholic Church."

Lieutenant-Colonel H. EVERITT spoke on the subject of maintaining a salutary influence over young men between their leaving school and their marriage, and argued that the influence of the clergy would be much more effective if they learned to feel with young men and not merely for them. They must go down to the level of young men, showing them that they had passed through the same temptations and trials which beset young men in their daily life. Impurity was the besetting sin of young men, and the clergy must, in dealing with it, take counsel with the White Cross Society as to the most effectual method of proceeding. If the work was to be effectual it must be practical, and the form it should take was the supervision of servants by their masters and mistresses, and of the employed in factories by their employers. With such supervision, and the provision of comfortable homes, residential clubs where they might enjoy good society and find recreation, the means of study, and religion for those who could be induced to accept it, much good might be done. As models of what he meant, he invited all to visit the Soldiers' Home and the Sailor's Rest. Such institutions must be made self-supporting. More guilds managed by laymen were needed, and the influence of women in the Church should be utilised.

Mr. J. G. ADDERLEY, speaking of working men's clubs in East London and large towns, said:—

There are many different kinds of East-end clubs. By far the larger number are great independent societies of artisans banded together, if not for a political purpose, at any rate with strong political views, generally of an extreme Radical type. Their club-house consists of reading-rooms, card-rooms, a drinking-bar, billiard-room, and music-hall. They are open from 6 to 12.30 every evening of the week. On Sundays they open at 10 and close for three hours at 3 o'clock, opening again at 6 and closing between 12 and 1.

At most of these clubs the card-playing is for money but not for large amounts, and only certain games are allowed at which gambling is not common. Anyone found playing high, or even playing a game well known as likely to lead to gambling, would be expelled. The entertainments are of various descriptions. In the larger clubs they are chiefly of the music-hall type, consisting of dancing, comic songs, and ballads. Many clubs have an amateur dramatic society among the members, who give performances periodically. The entertainments take place in some clubs two or three times a week, but the principal evenings are Saturday and Sunday. Political lectures are often given, especially on Sunday mornings. In most of these clubs there is a library, and the books are well read by a studious minority of the members. I may say, in passing, that there is a lower grade of club than this, where very much later hours are kept, more like some of the West-end clubs, in which drinking continues till 3 or 4 o'clock in the morning, and gambling is freely practised. Of the Church clubs, by which I mean those started under the wing of the Church, there are so many different kinds that I cannot give any description which would include them all. But they all vary, I think, according to the amount of their dependence on the Church or independence.

I do not pretend to be giving an exhaustive account of clubs, nor do I hope to suggest any remedies which are likely to be applicable everywhere; but I give just what, from a little personaal observation, has struck me as the deficiency of the existing club system.

The East-end clubs appear to me (and probably most clubs in our large towns appear to those who know them) to be suffering from one or all of three great evils. (1) The sale of intoxicating liquors; (2) the want of a higher influence at work among the members; (3) the want of a religious tone.

1. The question of drink in working men's clubs has, I know, been discussed a thousand times, but it seems as far from solution as ever. Ought alcoholic drinks to be sold in clubs or not? About twenty-five years ago, when the club movement was in its infancy, such an idea as the sale of alcohol in a club was considered an absurdity. The whole *raison d'être* of a club would seem to be lost by such a custom. It is interesting to read the prospectus of the Working Men's Club and Institute Union issued in 1862, where the object of the Union is declared to be the establishment of clubs and institutes for working men where they can meet for recreation and refreshment free from intoxicating drinks. The prospectus then goes on to say that the council are strongly of opinion that the introduction of intoxicating drinks would be dangerous to the interests of clubs, and earnestly recommend their extinction. The greatest advocates of drinking clubs must admit that it was not so from the beginning, and that clubs were intended to be a strong counteraction to the allurements of a publichouse.

But how far have these ideas of the original promoters been realised? What do we find now in East London and in most of our large towns? A myriad of clubs which are simply beersbops unfettered by the laws of closing. They are publichouses in disguise. I feel convinced that no club can do its proper work as long as intoxicating drinks are allowed to be sold. People will say about this just as they do about the Sunday question, that if a West-end gentleman is allowed his drink in his club why not the East-end? I do not think the cases are quite parallel. Refinement, culture, and recreation are the objects which an East-ender has in view in joining a club; while the West-ender has so many opportunities of finding these elsewhere that he uses his club as a place of refreshment more than anything else. The East-end clubs should be designed to avoid spending an evening in a place surrounded by moral danger. How can that be done where drink is freely sold?

2. I find the working-men's clubs of East London devoid of any elevating influence. It is obvious that such an influence must be exerted by those who are higher than the rest in point of education. Consequently, as long as working-men are left to themselves to manage their club, it will remain at the same dead level of dulness and educational apathy at which it began. The President of the Club Union told me the other day that, in his opinion, no club is carrying out its proper work unless it partakes somewhat of the nature of an institute as well. In a word, a raising influence must be at work. This can be done in many ways—by proper entertainments; by classes on all sorts of subjects; by lectures, not always political; by raising the tone of conversation, not only from bad to good, but from silly to sensible; by showing the men the difference between good and bad songs; by helping them in the choice of books; by giving them a new interest in reading their newspapers; by giving them *good* things, good music, good pictures, and the like.

But then arises the question, who is to do it? In Church clubs the clergy are supposed to, but as a rule their time is so much occupied in the evenings with other parochial work that they cannot do very much. I believe that this is a work to which laymen must give themselves. And for the independent clubs can Churchmen do nothing? Are they to be left to grow up as they have been left for the last twenty-five years, entirely in the hands of the working-men themselves, who, not through any fault of their own, are ignorant of almost all that makes life lovely and pleasant?

There are two ways in which this matter can be and is being faced. Either gentlemen, by which I mean those of us to whom God has given leisure, wealth, and education to use for His glory, can get themselves elected to these clubs, and by personal contact try and leaven the whole lump. This was the system adopted by the Bishop of Brisbane, when he was Rector of St. John's, Red Lion-square, and it is now being tried with some success by some University men that I know in London. But it is at best a slow and uncertain process, and will require a very much larger influx of willing lay-workers than the Church seems at present likely to attract. The other way is for gentlemen to organise new clubs and watch and guard their growth from the commencement so as to ensure a good healthy tone about the members.

The organising of good working men's clubs I believe to be the great work that the laymen of the Church of England ought to do. I see no reason why a hundred such clubs should not be started by Christian gentlemen in our large towns, where a high, manly, chivalrous tone should be fostered by personal contact. This is no more than Mr. Kingsley, or Mr. Morris, or Mr. Denison would have wished—what, in fact, they proposed, but which has never been carried out to any great extent.

That word "contact" is the key of the question. Men may theorise in the West-end, they may read the Bitter Cry and hold up their hands in horror at what they hear and read about the East, but if they want to do any good they must come and know the poor as friends. They may talk about touching the masses, but how can they touch a mass if they never let it come within reach of their hands? I long for the day when a crowd of hard-working, earnest Englishmen shall find their way into the back streets of our large towns and hold out the right hand of fellowship to the working-man.

There are plenty of people ready to come and teach them to be discontented, but why cannot a few be found to come and tell them that life has often joys to offer besides being a party politician?

Where would any of the most educated of us be if we had not had the help of a higher influence, a mother, a father or a friend? This is just the help which the poor East Londoner wants.

And, lastly, as to the directly religious influence in a men's club. This I believe to be the great deficiency of the existing system. Even in the best clubs, and those which owe their existence to the Church, I find that the clergy hope for very little beyond getting to know some of the men. The idea of making a club a great religious factor in a parish does not seem to be entertained. Yet I believe in not doing so they are losing one of the greatest means of making the men Christians.

Religion in working-men's clubs seems to be fought shy of by two classes of philanthropic workers. Firstly, by those who appear to think that a working-man is more likely to come to a knowledge of God by being taught science and history than by being taught the Gospel; and secondly, by those who think that there is a time for everything, and that a working-man comes to his club to get recreation, not to be preached at. Now I quite agree that it would be a mistake to try and force religion on to every member of a club, but what I contend is that religion should be there for those who want it.

Why should we be afraid of our religion? A great deal of harm is done by keeping it in the background. Working men before now have said that Churchmen do not seem to think religion very important, because they talk so little about it. Why should not religion enter into the conversation of a working men's club more than it does? The way I propose is:—Firstly, to keep up a strong Church connection, the clergy going to the club as often as they can possibly manage. What better opportunity can a clergyman have than this for showing the men that he is not only a man paid to preach on Sundays, or soothe a death-bed? Secondly, to establish a guild or society on a distinctly religious basis in direct union with the club, composed of club members only. In connection with this I would have Bible-classes for old and young members. There is a tendency to disbelieve in direct spiritual teaching as a means of making working-men religious. We have all sorts of plans talked about for raising the masses without religion, and we are always blinded by being told that it all leads to religion, and is therefore truly religious. We are told that a mosaic or a picture will lead people to God quite as quickly as the Gospel, besides having the advantage of being a new method. I always think these extra-Scriptural ways of preaching the Gospel are just as if the Apostles, when told by our Lord to let down the net to enclose the draught of fishes, had said, "No, that is an old-fashioned way: we prefer catching them with our hands." Have we any right to say that working-men will not accept religion, so we must give them other ways of education which we think they will accept? It is true that they will not accept religion as a *body* very kindly, but then do they accept the other ways of education kindly? Is not a little force necessary in other cases? Look at the empty museums and libraries; look at Epping Forest, within easy reach of the East London poor, yet almost unknown to them except as a place where good publichouses and donkey-rides are to be got. I think they accept religion, considering what an effort it must be to them, as well as anything else. But there are many clergy who would give the world to have more time to attend to their working-men's clubs. They have been obliged through stress of work to leave the clubs to themselves, and the consequences have been disastrous. Two clubs I know which were both started by clergymen, and were eventually Church institutions, but which are now rapidly degenerating into independent societies of the worst type. At one of them an elementary Atheism is at work, while drinking and gambling go on till a late hour every night. It must be confessed, I think, that the majority of clubs at this present moment are not doing the work they might be doing for Christ's Church, and all for the want of help from Churchmen.

If the clergy have not the time, the laymen must give this help. I am not advocating too much interference on the part of gentlemen in the government of a club. Such a thing as a committee of gentlemen, who, if they liked, could outvote the men, would be disastrous; but, at the same time, I should like gentlemen to have a share in the government and to be a distinct power.

But it may be said that working-men would resent this sort of thing. Not so if the gentlemen go the right way to work and make friends of them first before they do anything else. Friendship comes before advice or influence. We know in the ordinary course of our lives how much we resent advice given us by people we don't know. So much more in a club it is necessary that anyone who wants to advise or influence the men must first of all be their friend. Let such gentlemen come to these clubs laying aside all class distinctions and conventional prejudices, determined to show that gentlemen can be working-men, and that working-men can be gentlemen, and that both can be Christians. Briefly, then, I would suggest that Churchmen should start and work clubs wherever they can determine upon three things, the exclusion of alcoholic drinks, the keeping of a higher educational influence perpetually at work, and the maintenance of a Church connection and religious tone among the members. I would like the clergy to give as much of their time to the clubs as they can possibly spare from other parochial duties, and that laymen should supply what the clergy cannot do. I would suggest that great care should be taken to put down a tendency to split up into cliques, which is very common among working men; that the older men should be induced to mix with the younger, and the poorer class with the upper class of artisans; that *esprit de corps* should be kept up, and the club made not only a place to which men can go, but a society to which they can belong; that men should feel their own independence, and should not have reason to suspect that the club is a mere charitable institution.

The success with which God has crowned our small efforts of this kind down in Bethnal-green makes me feel certain that very much more can be done with working men's clubs than Churchmen at present are inclined to believe, and I offer what I have said just as a suggestion, hoping that those who have had more experience of the ins and outs of the question, and know the working men better than I do, will, at any rate, try and see if our clubs, whether old or new ones, cannot be made more what our Lord Jesus Christ would like to see them.

Mr. JOHN TREVARTHEN, president of the Guild of St. Albans, in opening the discussion, said that those Bishops, if there were any, who discouraged early confirmation were doing incalculable injury. After confirmation it was desirable to see that as many as possible of the confirmed became regular communicants.

Mr. JOHNSTONE BOURNE and others also spoke.

THE LECTURE HALL.

The subject for discussion at the afternoon meeting was—

THE RESPONSIBIEITY OF THE CHURCH AS REGARDS THE MORAL WELFARE OF OUR SOLDIERS AND SAILORS.

The Bishop of NEWCASTLE, on taking the chair, expressed his pleasure at seeing many soldiers and sailors in the meeting, and said it was right that the Church should recognise its duty towards those on whom the country so largely depended for the security which was vital to its prosperity.

The Rev. J. B. HARBORD, Chaplain of the Fleet, read the first paper as follows:—

As Chaplain of the Fleet, the Church Congress has done me the honour of asking me to read the first paper on that important subject which the *genius loci* of its present session suggests:—"The Responsibility of the Church as regards the Spiritual and Moral Welfare of our Soldiers and Sailors." While speaking specially of our "First Line of Defence," I shall endeavour to confine myself to principles applicable also on the one hand to the sister service—the Army, and on the other hand to that large body of seamen engaged in commerce, with whom we are definitely linked by means of the Royal Naval Reserves. [These number about 19,000, provision being made for 20,000.]

The form of the thesis laid down by the Subjects Committee suggests three lines of thought:—(1) The combination of the two words "spiritual" and "moral" is very significant; (2) There are the reflections which arise from the word "responsibility;" and (3) The ideas attached to the word "Church."

I. The first of these topics, though vitally important, may be soon disposed of. I would simply say that you must never separate "moral" and "spiritual" in speaking to such men. You will find they have very practical ideas about religion; at least I can answer for the seamen and marines of the Fleet. They regard it as a sham if it does not make you chaste and sober, just and true; a man's spiritual condition they will judge of only by the life he leads. On the other hand, there is need to bear in mind the danger of supposing you can achieve morality, that will stand the terrible strain of the worry and temptations of a seaman's life, without religious sanctions and spiritual grace. You cannot secure the spiritual welfare of seamen without you guard their morals; you cannot keep them moral without they become spiritually-minded. But I would desire also to use the word "moral" not in this limited technical sense only, but with its larger scientific meaning, which regards a moral being as synonymous with a conscientious responsible agent whose free will is controlled and directed by a sense of right and duty.

II. We can now pass on to our second head. When we speak of "responsibility" there is generally a feeling of blame attaching to the past and a recognition of duty with respect to the present and future; there is also the question of who has been to blame and on whom the acknowledged obligations rest for fulfilment. The blame for the past we may all accept with profit to ourselves, and be content with the general and comprehensive description embodied in the simple word "Church." But when we come to discuss the present and the future, if we desire practical results we must not rest satisfied with an abstraction, but endeavour to apportion the different parts and varying degrees of responsibility to tangible sections of the institution we call the "Church;"

nor can we be content with speaking of classes of persons, but should try to bring home finally to each member of the Church his individual share of responsibility. [Time precludes my entering upon the question of responsibility when measured by the momentous and far-reaching consequences of its neglect or fulfilment. In the case in question, the effect on the evangelisation of the heathen is a familiar and sufficient illustration.]

III. Let us, then, in the next place, look at this word "Church." We may take it here to mean our National Church, and narrow the question to the responsibility of the Church of England towards English seamen and soldiers.

Now, our Church in her arrangements for government and ministry is strictly territorial with her provinces, dioceses, and parishes; and seamen and soldiers, from the nature of their calling, cannot be comprehended in or completely reached by this system. The matter resolves itself, then, into this: The responsibility of the Church of England towards classes whose special clergy are in no way represented in the convocations of her provinces, who are exempt from the jurisdiction of the Ordinaries of her dioceses, and whose people are practically excluded, for protracted periods, from the regular parochial ministrations of the land.

(1) The Convocation of Canterbury has recognised the responsibility to inquire into the question; but the difficulties attending any legislation were, I think, acknowledged by the Upper House delaying the consideration of it until eventually a Committee of the Lower House took the matter up. While the attention of the Church at large was thus directed to the spiritual needs of seamen, the methods and results of the investigation did not commend themselves to those principally concerned.

(2) The special responsibilities of the Bishops with reference to seamen and soldiers, it seems to me, lie in their having to meet and overcome two difficulties.

The first applies chiefly to the Navy and the Army, and is this:—How to extend their episcopal functions to those who are not under their jurisdiction. Practically this is no difficulty, for our Right Rev. Fathers in God do not appear to consider that their sacred responsibilities are limited by technical questions of jurisdiction where no other ecclesiastical authority is interfered with.

The second point has chiefly to do with the Mercantile Marine, and is this:—How to provide for the masses of extra population that the development of commerce brings into the diocese, throwing out of adjustment the ancient distribution of spiritual provision, especially in view of the character of much of this additional population—birds of passage belonging equally to other dioceses. The difficulty is to provide funds for more churches and clergy to serve these new and abnormal centres of population. It is a particular case of a great modern call upon the Church. The Bishop of London's Fund is, perhaps, the most conspicuous attempt to supply the necessary provision from diocesan resources; but a set of institutions had previously developed themselves in our Church which have aimed to meet special needs in a more comprehensive and national manner—I refer to our great societies which are independent of any particular diocese. When our Church woke to her responsibilities towards those of her children who leave her shores to settle in distant lands, the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel arose; when the Church recognised her responsibility to extend the blessings of education to the poor, the National Society was definitely evolved from the much older Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge; and when—far later, alas!—the Church began to feel her responsibility towards the seamen of our island home, societies were formed to collect, organise, and administer the liberality of the faithful for their moral and spiritual welfare. Thus, by contributions from the whole country many seaboard dioceses have been subsidised by the Missions to Seamen Society, and by the St. Andrew's Waterside Mission. These societies, while working in harmony with the diocesan system, have also followed with their fostering care the seaman as he crosses the ocean, and met him with a helping hand in the harbours of our colonial dioceses and in foreign ports of call. They have thus been the means of supplying a need which the Church has not been able otherwise to provide for, and every Churchman is now responsible that these organisations, which have already done so much good, shall not appeal in vain for funds to carry on and extend their important work.

(3) And now we come to the parochial system, and ask how far it is responsible for the spiritual provision for seamen when at home. With respect to merchant seamen, it must be borne in mind that about one-half of them are always in port or on shore in the United Kingdom. [The Census returns for 1881 give the merchant seamen in port or on shore in the United Kingdom only, on the night of the 3rd of April, 1881, as 128,036; and the Registrar-General of Seamen gives the number of seamen absent from the United Kingdom on board ship on the same day as 120,649. The Census, also, gives the men absent, chiefly on small coasting vessels, and not included in the 120,649, as 9,938.] For those whose families are not regular parishioners, in some places special seamen's churches have been built with great advantage. With respect to the Royal Navy, it must be borne in mind that about three-fourths of the seamen and marines of the Fleet are married men, whose families live chiefly in the vicinity of our seaports. Now, these people do not like special churches to be provided for them as distinct from their fellow-citizens and neighbours, and the same is true of unmarried bluejackets when spending their Sunday on shore. Where are they to go? They cannot be expected to rent pews by the quarter, and they will not sit in the free seats of a parish church, any more than they would think of accepting parish relief; they will not obtrude where they imagine they have no right, nor revisit a place where they have been made to feel they are not welcome. The only churches, in my opinion, that will be frequented by them are open churches where they can sit in any part and pay, like every one who comes to worship there, at the offertory. For it must not be supposed that seamen will not contribute towards their own spiritual requirements. The history of Portsmouth well illustrates that they will do so most liberally. One hundred and eighty years ago, besides the garrison chapel, once appertaining to the monastery of Domus Dei, the only two churches here were the parish churches of St. Mary, Portsea, and St. Thomas, Portsmouth. In the Royal Dockyard there was a chaplain for "Her Majesty's ships in ordinary and rigging wages," but no chapel; and the officers and men of the yard who lived on the spot were deprived of opportunities for regular public worship by reason of "the extream badness and distance of the wages towards either Portsmô or Kingston churches." Under these circumstances St. Anne's Chapel was built in 1704 "*by ye voluntary contribution of ye officers and seamen of ye Royall Navy* and generous presents of some neighbouring gentlemen," [See inscription over west door of the dockyard chapel], and "endowed by the officers, artificers, and workmen of this yard" with "two pence p. month deducted out of their respective wages." [Warrant giving authority to build the chapel at Portsmouth, "for celebration of Divine Service, Administration of the Lord's Supper, and Preaching without any Parochial Duty," signed by George, Lord High Admiral, dated 23rd Feb., 1702.] The history of the Chapel at "Plymouth Dock" is very similar. This is sufficient to show that the officers and men of the Royal Navy do acknowledge their responsibility in making provision for their own spiritual welfare; and it leads me to speak of this part of our subject.

And first as to the ruling authority. If the State withdraws a body of her citizens from the ordinary spiritual arrangements of the land she incurs special responsibilities. The soldiers and sailors of pagan Rome and Carthage might be regarded in the same light as their cavalry horses and the hulls of their shipping; but because England is a Christian State she is responsible for the moral and spiritual condition of all her people, including those who fight her battles by sea and by land. The union of Church and State enables me here to refer to this responsibility while keeping strictly within the question before the Congress.*

How, then, should the Admiralty discharge its responsibilities for the spiritual and moral welfare of the seamen and marines of the Fleet? We answer—Chiefly by wise and true legislation; for an ample supply of clergy is well-nigh powerless without this. But, of course, we shall be met with that misleading platitude, "You cannot make men virtuous by legislation." We reply—You may keep men vicious by injurious regulations, or even from lack of honestly enforced laws; and the authorities may authorise or wink at customs which effectually prevent any improvement in morality and religion. Such was formerly the case in the Royal Navy, when a short-sighted policy considered it almost a necessity to encourage improvidence, dissipation, and vice; when the system of leave, payment of wages and prize-money, and the conditions of service militated most effectually against any spiritual advance. The great fundamental change was made when the Admiralty determined to train our seamen from boys to be rational, responsible beings. I well remember when, a quarter of a century since, the training-ships were established, and it was made a vital point of the system to educate the lads into a sense of being moral agents. Each was to be allowed a certain amount of pocket-money and sent on shore on leave on two half-holidays, and thus they have grown up, learning to spend their money rationally, to be thoughtful and moderate in their enjoyments, and to come off to their leave. This may appear a trifle to lay so much stress upon, but it is at the root of much of the improvement we have witnessed, and illustrates how you may help to make seamen virtuous by sensible Christian legislation. They now feel they are responsible moral agents, and this is solid ground for reality in religious life.

And this leads me to speak of the responsibility of seamen towards themselves as members of the Church. It is too much the habit to think of sailors as a class outside the Church, to whom the Church is to send missions as if they were heathen. Let us get rid of this idea, and remember that our seamen are baptised Christians forming an integral portion of the Church to which we belong. At any rate, the Royal Navy, with a chaplain on an average to every 600 men, is not in a condition of "spiritual destitution." By the circumstances of our calling we have much need of sympathy, but the help we most need is that which shall aid us in recognising that we are ourselves chiefly responsible for our religious welfare. The Naval Church Society exists for this very object. The naval clergy, the naval laity—officers, petty-officers, men, and boys—must all and each realise this, or our ships' companies will never have a religion that will stand them in need when their country calls them for service, even unto death, to the ends of the earth, and in the uttermost parts of the sea.

The question before us is not only a national but an imperial one, affecting our most distant possessions equally with the old country. Now that the confederation of groups of our Colonies is becoming a reality, and the consolidation of the scattered sections of our race is shaping itself into more than a vision of the distant future, why should not the mother and daughter Churches of the Anglican Communion co-operate more effectually in the care of our seamen, who knit the whole together, and who should find their Church welcoming them wherever they go? It is not a matter to be dealt with by isolated seaport parishes, or by separate seaboard dioceses, or even by the provinces of Canterbury and York, though aided by voluntary societies independent of ecclesiastical limits; it is rather one of those subjects which should be managed more comprehensively by the Catholic Church both at home and abroad. A central Board might be formed under the presidency of the Metropolitan of all England, from whom not a few dioceses abroad hold mission; on it, their commissaries in England would be the delegates of the Colonial Bishops; our maritime clergy—whether beneficed or not—would be represented, and the Army and Navy and Mercantile Marine would have a voice and the means of feeling themselves in vital union and co-operation with their Church. Such a Council should consist both of clergy and laity, the latter element embodying the influence of our great shipping interests.

To sum up, the whole Anglican Communion of our great Empire must take heed to its responsibilities towards our seamen; the Church of England, with its organisation of provinces, dioceses, and parishes, must take heed to her responsibilities towards them, especially when they are at home; the State Departments which control the fighting services of our Christian country must take heed to their responsibilities, especially when the Navy and the Army leave our shores for the defence of our people; and our seamen and our soldiers themselves—clergy, officers, and men—must take heed to the responsibilities which rest upon their own heads as part of the Church of their native land.

Let me conclude by relating an incident which shows how a man is saved at sea—not by his own exertions and endurance, but not without them; not by the lifebuoy only, or the gallant efforts of the lifeboat's crew, but not without the boat; not by the noble ship herself, with her captain, officers, and men, but not without their hearty co-operation and patient standing-by. Which things are an allegory.

I was on my way from the West Indies in one of our finest frigates. We were in the middle of the Atlantic, and had been bowling towards England at a splendid rate all day, with a fresh breeze on our quarter; the seamen said their friends at home had got hold of the tow-ropes—they were buoyant with hope and in high spirits. In the evening, before the watch was called, hands were on deck to make the ship snug for the night. The usual reef was taken in and hands were piped down from aloft, when the second captain of the maintop—one of the smartest and most promising of our young seamen—fell from the rigging and was thrown into the sea. I was standing close to the commander on the poop, and at the cry "Man overboard!" we looked over the side together. As the ship shot past him, the man looked up and said calmly to the commander, "Save me, sir!" and in this trustful spirit did what he could to save himself—he was a good swimmer and kept himself afloat. Both lifebuoys astern were let go; one dropped close to our shipmate, but, alas! without its beacon; the other followed, and we rejoiced to see its light as it floated at a short distance from the first. The lifeboat's crew were in their boat, and she was away after the light in what seemed to be but a few seconds of time. As the short twilight closed in darkness soon hid the struggling cutter from our view, but the twinkle of the lifebuoy appeared now and then when not hidden in the trough of the waves. With the darkness a most solemn silence settled on the ship, now laid-to. The little light ceased to reappear, and anxiety was felt for the boat also, as the sea was running high and the weather threatening. We could only help now by our position, lights, and our silent prayers. A sympathetic tension of suspense held those 500 men for the half-hour we all stood peering into the darkness and listening. Then the rhythmic beat of oars was faintly heard, but we had to wait in uncertainty for some long moments still, until at last, through the darkness of the night, over the troubled waters, came those words that seamen know so well—"All right!"

The Rev. Canon Beach, Principal Chaplain to the Forces at Aldershot, said:—

It would be a waste of valuable time to argue at any length that the Church *is* responsible for the religious welfare of our Army and Navy, for the title of this subject takes that for granted, and I accept it as a happy omen that it has been thus worded. Our soldiers and sailors, though a separate class of men, belong to the nation—for whose good they exist and whose interests they are always ready, and even eager, to defend; they have therefore a right to the care and training of the National Church, which is the mother of us all. The Naval view of the question has been placed before you by my friend the Chaplain of the Fleet, whom I met many years ago in China, and whom I am glad to meet again on this common ground to-day. My remarks will be confined to the Army, and before proceeding to discuss the subject I must ask you to remember that the short service system, by which soldiers are now returned to civil life at a much earlier period than formerly, to be either a blessing or a bane to the parishes where they settle, increases the responsibility of the Church for their proper education and training in Christian doctrine and practice. Now, this subject of the Church's responsibility suggests two questions for consideration—viz., What is the Church now doing for our soldiers? and what more ought she to do for their moral and spiritual welfare?

I. As to the former it is necessary to remark that the Church discharges her responsibility in a rather indirect, not to say irregular, manner. By this I mean that her proper rulers—the Bishops—have very little immediate control over the religion of the Army. That is placed under the direction of His Royal Highness the Field Marshal Commanding-in-Chief and the Secretary of State for War, with whom rest the appointment of Chaplains, including the Chaplain-General, the erection of Churches, and to some extent even the ordering of Divine service. I am not expressing any opinion on this: I am simply stating the fact; and I do so, as will be seen before I conclude, with a practical object in view. The fact, however, justifies my remark that the general oversight of religion in the Army is committed to a department of the State rather than to the Bishops of the Church. No doubt the high military authorities mentioned devolve the burden in a great measure upon the shoulders of the Chaplain-General; and here I may be pardoned for saying that the appointment of Dr. Elghill was hailed with great satisfaction, because we all knew him to possess, in addition to many personal qualifications, the valuable (I had almost said the essential) qualification of a varied experience of the needs and habits of soldiers, gained during many years of faithful service as a commissioned chaplain to the forces, both at home and abroad. But to return, although the Church, strictly speaking, does not exercise direct supervision over the Army, she indirectly does much for us, although not as much as she might.

She, of course, supplies the Chaplains, who are selected from clergy in full orders, and provides for the performance of Divine service and the administration of the Sacraments, according to the Book of Common Prayer, which is her gift. By her Bishops she confirms the families of our soldiers and many of the men who enlist unconfirmed; and the visits of our Fathers in God for this purpose are always welcomed by officers and men, as well as by the chaplains.

The duties of chaplains are laid down in the "Queen's Regulations and Orders for the Army," and it may be interesting to the Congress to know what they are. We are required to perform Divine service for the troops every Sunday, Christmas Day, and Good Friday at a Service which is known as the Parade Service; and this is to be conducted in accordance with "Instructions for the guidance of Chaplains of the Church of England in their ministrations to the Troops," issued by the Chaplain-General and approved by the Commander-in-Chief. "Chaplains" are further "required to render all the spiritual assistance in their power to officers and their families, as well as to the families of the men, whether on the 'Married Roll' or not, and to the men themselves, whom they are to regard in every respect as their parishioners." Their duties, as well as those of officiating clergymen in receipt of capitation pay, include "Baptisms, churchings, and funerals, attending the sick in hospital, and reading prayers with the convalescents at least once in each week, giving special religious instruction to the children and drummers during one hour in every week," and it is expressly provided that "no fees are to be demanded for the performance of any of these duties." These things we are "required" to do, and it may perhaps be some consolation to those clergy who chafe under the provisions of the New Clergy Discipline Act, that they are not worse off than their brethren in the Army. I don't think we have found much reason to complain on this head; and I need not say that no Chaplain worth his salt thinks of confining himself to the bare letter of the Queen's Regulations, which may be considered to contain the *minimum* of what he is bound to do. No express mention, for example, is made in those "Regulations" of the Holy Communion, although in the "Instructions" before referred to Chaplains are directed to "administer" that Sacrament "at least once in every month, and also on the high Festivals of the Church." And I am glad to say, in passing, that in the Standing Orders of the Aldershot Division, "Commanding officers are requested to allow any soldier who may wish to attend Holy Communion to remain in church after the regiment leaves it, without previously asking permission"—a provision which, I trust, will some day find its way into the Queen's Regulations for the whole Army, and which, if carried out in the spirit as well as the letter, will be an immense gain. By the same "Instructions" Chaplains are to conduct "an evening Service (known as the Voluntary Service) on each Sunday, for the benefit of the families of officers and soldiers, and of all other persons who may be willing to attend; and "recommended" to establish in addition "a short evening Service, with a lecture or sermon, at least once in every week, and twice, if possible, during the seasons of Advent and Lent;" also, "wherever the custom can be introduced and maintained," Daily Prayers. I am happy to be able to say that in a few Stations it has been found possible to establish Daily Evensong, as in this garrison, for instance. In a few more there is an early celebration of the Holy Communion every Sunday and Holy-day; and I hope and believe this will become more general as the undoubted benefits resulting from the practice become better known. And here I must thankfully acknowledge that much greater liberty of action is now enjoyed by Chaplains and religious men in the Army than when I entered it twenty-five years ago; and that by the establishment of such Societies as the Guild of the Holy Standard, an Army division of the Church of England Temperance Society, the Army Missionary Association, and last, though not least, the Church of England Soldiers' Institute at Aldershot, our opportunities for promoting the spiritual and moral welfare of soldiers have been greatly increased.

II. I would gladly say something of the working of these societies, but I must leave that to succeeding speakers, and hasten on to the less welcome, but very important task, of pointing out some defects and hindrances, in the hope that the Church, recognising her responsibility, may bring her influence to bear upon the proper Authorities for their gradual removal.

(1) And, foremost in the list, I must place the want of proper Edifices for Divine worship. I have no hesitation whatever in stating that this is a real hindrance to religion in the Army. I fully recognise the great truth that the Divine Presence is not dependent upon magnificent Temples, or even upon anything "made by hands." I know that that Presence was manifested to Jacob in "a certain place" in the open air, and that the patriarch said, "This is none other but the House of God, and this is the gate of heaven!" But that was after a balmy night spent in the sweet atmosphere of Palestine, where the surrounding scenery naturally lifted his thoughts to that Heaven which he had been beholding in his dreams. I think it would require more imagination and more faith than you have any right to look for in the ordinary British soldier to be able to rise to the same elevation of spirit amid the surroundings of a bare, uncongenial, unsanctified barrack schoolroom, to which he has been marched during the week for tasks not always welcome to him, and which is transformed for the time being into a Chapel. Is it fair to expect him in such circumstances to realise the beauty of holiness and to worship God with reverence? Then, some of the so-called Churches are big wooden structures, devoid of all ecclesiastical ornament, exceedingly uncomfortable on windy and rainy Sundays, and possessing no single recommendation save that of being constructed to hold 1,000 men. And these, you must remember, are shared by Roman Catholics and Presbyterians with the Church of England. Some years ago the following transformation scene was enacted in one of these wooden buildings every Sunday morning. Our Presbyterian brethren led the forlorn hope at 8.30, when a curtain was drawn across the Chancel to prevent them from being distracted during their Service by the sight of the Altar belonging to the Roman Catholics. An hour later the curtain was removed, and thus at ten o'clock our brethren of that Communion were able to worship according to their more ornate and elaborate ritual. We of the English Church succeeded at 11.30. You will wonder what happened between, and perhaps the susceptibilities of some good Protestant brother may be aroused lest it should be found that we actually used the same Altar as the Roman Catholics. I am able to reassure him. That Altar was ingeniously constructed to run upon wheels, and being thus removed to an adjoining vestry, our modest Altar, similarly constructed, was wheeled in from the opposite vestry, and our service proceeded according to what Keble called that "sober standard" which it is the peculiar happiness of the Church of England to possess. That process of transformation is still carried on in its latter details at Aldershot every Sunday, the only difference being that other arrangements have been made for the Presbyterian service. On the other hand, we have two Churches in that Division, one of them consecrated, which we are thankful for. And there are a few—but only a few—in other Stations which almost rival in beauty the fine old Garrison Church in this good town of Portsmouth, owing their beauty in a great measure to the private liberality of Officers and men who have contributed to their restoration or adornment. That decent and well-ordered churches are appreciated by soldiers is certain. Considering the general surroundings of their lives—accustomed as they are to good music and smart uniforms, and "all the pomp and circumstance of war"

* This obligation of a Christian nation does not, however, depend upon there being an Established Church, as is illustrated by the United States of America. The religious conscience of the American people insists upon their naval and military forces being supplied with chaplains, and the ordinances of religion being provided for and duly observed. It may be here interesting to note that although the Protestant Episcopal Church is by no means the largest in the States, one half of the Naval chaplains and two-thirds of Army chaplains belong to that Church, the rest being Wesleyans, Presbyterians, or Baptists. Again, on board American men-of-war the Common Prayer-Book of the American Protestant Episcopal Church is in general use: in ships without chaplains, the service, read by the captain or other officer, is always from the Prayer-Book; it is also adopted by many of the chaplains of different denominations. The same is the case in the Army. Such facts as these may serve to stimulate the Church of England in her efforts to occupy fully, with zeal and efficiency, the field we are considering. Should the day be at hand when the Church of England is disestablished, her children in the Navy and in the Army will remain faithful to her if she now fulfils her responsibilities towards them.

—it would be surprising if this were not the case. I may mention, as an instance of the interest felt in the subject, that only a few months ago it was my privilege to receive, and to present and place upon the Altar at an early Celebration, the sum of £7 10s., the offering of a non-commissioned officer towards clearing off a debt which remained upon a handsome white frontal for the Holy Table. He had just received a small legacy, and he thus at once testified his gratitude to God and his love for the place where His honour dwelleth. I do trust that this Congress will help us to get the many wretched substitutes for churches now existing abolished, and suitable Chapels erected in every station in the British Army. The Convocation of Canterbury has already spoken out on the subject, and I have good reason to believe that the highest Officer in the Army would gladly see an improvement in this respect.

(2) More Chaplains are also needed. It is impossible for one clergyman to do all that it is in his heart to do for a Brigade consisting of three Regiments, especially when these Regiments are constantly changing from station to station. An intelligent non-commissioned officer lately said to me, "Why should there not be a Chaplain to every regiment, sir? There is a Paymaster and a Schoolmaster; why not a clergyman also, who should belong to us and move about with us, and thus become well acquainted with our families, and be our friend as well as our Chaplain?" He added, "I don't think his pay would be any loss to the country in the long run, for a great deal of drunkenness and vice would be prevented." This was a spontaneous expression of opinion from an old soldier, and I think you will agree with me that he had a great deal of reason on his side. The number of Chaplains should be increased if the spiritual and moral condition of our soldiers is to be really improved, and the Church should strongly represent this to those who have the power to increase them.

(3) And this brings me to another very important and much to be desired object, viz:—More direct recognition of our work in the Army by the Church as a Body, of which we are members. I know that I am here treading upon delicate ground, but as I feel strongly on the subject, I think it best not to avoid it. I remarked in the beginning of this paper that the Church's responsibility as regards the Army is indirectly discharged. Perhaps, from the nature of the case, this is unavoidable; but might we not be brought into closer relation to her without undergoing any very revolutionary process? For instance, might not the Chaplain-General and the Chaplain of the Fleet be *ex officio* members of Convocation? And might not the state of religion in the Army and Navy be considered there, under their guidance, every year, instead of at long intervals? Last February some valuable resolutions were passed by both Houses—resolutions formulated by a Committee appointed to consider and report upon the spiritual condition of our soldiers and sailors. Why should not that Committee be a standing one? Resolutions, however good, have a tendency to die away and be forgotten, unless they are looked after by those who pass them; and I am persuaded that it would inspire us with fresh life if we were brought into more immediate fellowship, through the proper channels of communication, with the Church at large.

We all know how deep an interest the Bishop of this diocese takes in the spiritual welfare of the Army and Navy; and I cannot forbear saying, with all respect, that if the Bishops generally would summon Chaplains to hear their Charges at their Visitations, as his Lordship kindly does, it would be a help to us, making us feel that we were truly one with our brother clergy in civil life, bound by the same solemn vows and obligations, and engaged in the same holy work. In my last station (Sandhurst) the Rural Dean called upon me as soon as I arrived, and regularly invited me to his chapters. It was a great boon to meet, and to compare notes with, the parochial and other clergy who assembled at Wokingham; and my brother Chaplains at Aldershot, as well as myself, would highly prize such opportunities of meeting and conferring with the clergy of the neighbouring parishes if it were thought good to invite us. Our Army is largely recruited from the rural districts, and many of our soldiers were not long ago boys in the village schools. It ought to be to our mutual advantage that we who have to carry on the education commenced in those schools should be in close ecclesiastical relation with the clergy who have baptised and trained them in the rudiments of the Christian faith.

Parish priests can assist us materially in our work by sending us letters when any of their parishioners enlist. We do get hold of young fellows now and then by this means, and, I hope, influence them for good when they are new to Army life. It is pleasant to see the face of a soldier brighten as the Chaplain tells him he has heard of him from his former clergyman, and talks to him for a few moments in some quiet corner of his village home. I beg to assure the parochial clergy that such letters of introduction are highly valued by us, and are always attended to, sometimes with very happy results. One more remark upon this part of my subject, and I have done. I wish there were any chance of seeing a grave omission in the Public Prayers of the Church supplied. When the comprehensive nature of the Litany is considered, it seems surprising that our soldiers and sailors should not be mentioned. In time of war special prayers are directed to be offered for them, and the whole nation rises to the occasion, and from every church in the land there goes up to heaven earnest intercession for their safety and success. Why should the Church be silent on their behalf in time of peace? Is it too much to hope that ere long some such suffrage as is found in the book of *Family Prayers*, prepared and published by authority of the Upper House of Convocation of the Province of Canterbury, may find its way into the public Liturgy of the Church, and thence into the hearts of her faithful people?—"On all who defend our country by land or by sea, on those who bear the sword to execute Thy wrath on evil-doers, and to maintain the right against oppression and wrong.—We pray for thy blessing, O, Lord." I cannot conclude this imperfect outline of what I feel to be a very important subject without saying that I do not by any means take a gloomy view of the future. The revival of religious life in the Church has extended, notwithstanding our disadvantages, to the Army, and progress has certainly been made during the last few years. Commanding officers of Garrisons, and of Regiments and Corps, are generally willing to support the Chaplain in his work. Not a few of them are regular communicants, and show examples of godly living to their men. And religion in the Army is of a manly, straightforward type, bearing the stamp of reality—a type which enables both Officers and men to live pure lives in the midst of many temptations, and also to meet death bravely and without fear. The world has admired the noble and unselfish life and death of Gordon. I believe there are many of the same spirit in the Army, and not only in the higher grades, but in the rank and file likewise. We ask our brother Churchmen to help us to increase the number of those who shall faithfully represent them, as he did, in heathen and strange lands.

With better Churches, more Chaplains, and a fuller recognition by the Church of the claims of our soldiers upon her sympathy and aid, I believe the British Army will become, year by year, more deeply imbued with the spirit of our holy Religion; and will prove not simply as heretofore the safeguard of national liberty, but also the staunch supporter of that "peace and happiness, truth and justice, religion and piety," which are the great elements of national greatness, and for which we are taught to pray.

Miss Weston, in the absence of Admiral Duncan Grant, read a paper, in which she detailed the working of Sailors' Rests, and one good that had resulted from them. She submitted that personal influence and woman's influence was the missing link in the Navy, and that it was partly supplied by the Rests she had described.

Lieutenant-Colonel Walker said it was essential that chaplains should attend actively to their work, but it was almost impossible by the Army regulations for them to do so. What they wanted, to enable chaplains to overcome these difficulties, were Church centres in every garrison; social places where they could meet the soldiers as friends; and the establishment of a lay agency for the Army.

The Rev. Dr. Edghill (Chaplain General), in closing the discussion, observed that the Church ought to see that she filled the obligations she took upon herself. The Church of England had done less for the soldiers than any other body of Christians. They wanted a standing Committee or some authority to look after the interests of soldiers, so far as Church privileges were concerned. If the mere fact of there being a Chaplain General was to absolve the Church of their great responsibilities, then he said, Perish the Chaplain General. The Chaplain General in himself was of little power, but with the Church behind him he would be a power which would be difficult to overcome.

The meeting then closed.

At the evening meeting the subject of—

THE PRAYER-BOOK—THE REARRANGEMENT OF SERVICES AND SUPPLEMENTARY SERVICES

was discussed.

The Very Rev. Lord Alwyne Compton (Prolocutor of Canterbury and Dean of Worcester) read the following paper:—

I have been asked to read a paper on the Prayer-Book, and to speak first of the rearrangement of the services, and next of supplementary services. On the first point I shall say very little. There was formerly a doubt whether any arrangement of the services was legal, except that which had long been usual—viz., the Litany and Communion Service following without any break after Morning Prayer. But this doubt, arising I suppose from considering the rubrics as part of an Act of Parliament, and so not to be freely interpreted or set aside by ecclesiastical authority, has received its solution from this Act of Uniformity Amendment Act (35 and 36 Vict., cap. 35), which distinctly authorises the use of the various services together or in varying order as separate services, allows the use of the Litany at Evensong, and the preaching of sermons without any previous service. It is hardly necessary for me to go into the question whether it is well to avail ourselves of this and the other provisions of the Act, and to what extent we should do so; the general principles of our action must be to do all things to edification, all things decently and in order; and the application of these principles will vary according to local circumstances. As regards supplementary services, the question is a far more difficult one. By supplementary services I understand services to be used upon special occasions, other than those provided for in the occasional offices in the Prayer-Book. The number of such special occasions is almost unlimited. A zealous member of the Lower House of the Convocation of Canterbury has given notice of a motion directing a committee to provide for seventeen occasions. *Visitatio Infirmorum* contains about twenty-five offices; and the *Priest's Prayer-Book*, published by Masters, has nearly a hundred for the use of priests, besides others for Bishops. I may mention briefly some of the special objects for which such additional offices are proposed. The American "Protestant Episcopal Church" has under its consideration, as additions to the Common Prayer-book, a form of thanksgiving for harvest; a form of prayer for visitation of prisoners; forms of prayer for use in families; form of consecration of a church or chapel; an office of institution of ministers into parishes or churches. If we add to these offices for particular cases of sickness—for the impenitent, the despairing, the insensible, for one about to undergo an operation, for the dying, for the friends of one deceased; offices for admission to particular positions, a chorister, a member of a guild, or a Sisterhood: for meetings of particular bodies of persons, confirmation, and communicant-classes, guilds, Ruridecanal Chapters—I need hardly go on with the ever-lengthening list—how are these to be provided for?

The great difficulty, as regards any services for public use in church, is one of law. The Act of Uniformity, 13 and 14 Charles II. cap. 4, appears absolutely to forbid the use in churches or chapels of any form of prayer other than what is prescribed in the Book of Common Prayer. Notwithstanding this Act, special forms of prayer have from time to time been set forth by authority of the Crown, and there are a few instances in the reign of Queen Elizabeth when Bishops by their own sole authority, as it would appear, issued and directed the use of special forms, notwithstanding the equally stringent clause of the then existing Act. If this power is really lodged in their hands no difficulty remains. But the recently-passed Act of Uniformity Amendment Act clearly shows that in the mind of those who framed it Bishops have no such power. For it expressly confers upon them, not confirms, the power to permit the use of special forms of service on special occasions, and with this limitation, that there shall not be introduced into them anything, except anthems or hymns, which does not form part of the Holy Scriptures or Book of Common Prayer. This would cut off from Episcopal actions such forms as are now occasionally issued by the Crown and such forms as Bishops sometimes issued in Queen Elizabeth's reign; it would exclude all Collects, all thanksgivings, other than those in the Prayer-Book; it reduces the materials available to give a special character to the proposed offices, to Psalms and Lessons, hymns and anthems. Practically, it makes the public use in church of suitable forms of prayer for almost all special occasions impossible.

How is this difficulty to be met?

Can we fall back on the authority of the Bishop, who undoubtedly in ancient times had the right, ecclesiastically, to direct the use within his diocese of such prayers as he thought advisable? I think it is at least doubtful whether his powers have not been limited too much by the Acts of Uniformity (including 35 and 36 Vic., cap. 35). And were it not so, I doubt whether the single action of single Bishops would meet our requirements. For single events which seem to call for the prayers of the Church no doubt it would suffice; but for what may be termed recurrent special occasions, it would seem better to act upon the principle of the Book of Common Prayer, and not to revert to the earlier variety of "uses," some churches "following Salisbury use, some Hereford use, and some the use of Bangor, some of York, some of Lincoln." There is an obvious convenience in having the new occasional offices, like the old ones, forming part of the Book of Common Prayer, which is in every one's hands.

If this is admitted, there seems to be only one body qualified by its position to take the needful steps in the preparation of such services, and that is Convocation. There we have the Bishops assembled together; there we have chosen representatives of the clergy; and there, I venture to say, after many years of personal knowledge, we shall always find some of them best qualified for the work in hand by their liturgical attainments, by their familiarity with Holy Scripture, by their experience of the needs of all classes of the people; some of those best qualified; the help of others, not actually members of the body, is easily attainable. The Convocation of Canterbury has already provided services for the induction and institution of incumbents, and for the Day of Intercession for Missions, which have been very generally used. For any larger scheme it would be well for the Convocations of the two provinces to act together as they did in respect of the Book of Common Prayer. This is not the proper occasion to discuss how such united action can best be secured now; but I assume it can be secured. The materials for such offices are abundant; the ancient service books of the Western Churches abound in Collects, the Oriental Liturgies in longer prayers, which merely require a little modification to fit them for the particular purpose in view, and besides these, many of which are now available in translations, the devotional works of our divines from the Reformation to the present day will supply much to the judicious compiler, and we have among us some who can themselves compose prayers well suited for the use of the Church. With respect to the form in which such occasional offices should be cast, I think we shall be wise to follow the form of those in the Prayer-book, which are already familiar to the laity, with perhaps some slight modifications either for simplicity on the one hand or enrichment of the offices on the other.

And how are such offices to be legally used? I have pointed out the difficulty. The Act of Uniformity Amendment Act confines us to the words of the Prayer-Book and Bible; and anyone examining the two offices drawn up by the Convocation of Canterbury will see how great an obstacle this is. I hardly think that it would be enough, or that it would be wise, merely to seek for the excision of this limitation. I think there might be some jealousy, not unjustifiable, on the part of the laity, of an absolute power in the hands of every Bishop of authorising whatever services he pleased. I think, therefore, that what we need is an Act, whereby the Queen in Council should be enabled to authorise the use of special services after they have been laid before Parliament for forty days. Such an Act would acknowledge the power of veto possessed by Parliament—possessed in consequence of the existence of the Acts of Uniformity. I do not discuss whether such a power should be in the hands of the Legislature: I simply accept facts, and seek for the best means, under existing circumstances, of gaining what we need—what is commonly termed greater elasticity in the matter of public services. The Bill prepared by the Lower House of Convocation of Canterbury in the year 1878, taken in great measure from a previous Bill of the Bishop of London, provided, first, for the legalisation of the amendments in the Book of Common Prayer agreed to by the two Convocations of Canterbury and York, when the report of the Ritual Commission was before them; and secondly, as to the future, it enacted that the Presidents and other ten Bishops and clergy of the two Convocations, by and with the authority of the Queen's Majesty, signified to them in such manner as Her Majesty shall see fit, may from time to time prepare and lay before Her Majesty in Council a scheme for making such alterations in and additions to the rubrics and directions contained in the Book of Common Prayer, and for providing such additional services and prayers to be used in public worship as may from time to time seem to them to be required. Such schemes to be laid before both Houses of Parliament, and if not objected to in forty days then to be considered by Her Majesty in Council, and if then approved to be authorised by Order in Council. If such an Act could be passed it would, I think, be found sufficient for our needs, but without it I do not see how it is possible to provide for many of these supplementary services. I have indeed mentioned that Convocation has already proposed one for the Day of Intercession for missions, and one for the institution and induction of new incumbents. But in both these cases the ordination services now forming part of the Prayer-Book supplied nearly all that was required. In the service for Missions Collects have been printed for private use during a period of silence. This is not quite satisfactory, but it was all that appeared possible to the committee which drafted the office. I venture then to press upon this Congress, and especially upon the laity, the great desirability of an enabling Act to untie our hands.

The Rev. E. N. Dumbleton also read a valuable paper on the same subject.

The Rev. Canon G. Venables said that the Church stood in pressing and immediate need of a few restorations and adaptations of some of her offices, arrangements also of an enormous number of supplementary offices or services, some for frequent use, others for occasional purposes within the consecrated buildings, and besides these there was need of a supply of special offices for the use of a recognised lay agency outside the Church edifices. The only wonder was that these wants, so fearfully pressing and imperious, had not long since been supplied by the Catholic Church of God in this land. There were varieties (God so made it to be) in the minds of men. Were they, then, to compel them always into exactly the same mould of thought and of worship? Would that be "Pauline Catholicity," or would it not savour rather of the dungeons of an Inquisition? Beyond a liberal interpretation of rubrics, and a consensus among ruling Bishops as to the occasional use of special psalms and lessons, there was no great need for any other rearrangement of existing services. If the Book of Common Prayer were uniformly printed, as it ought to be, with every section or even every prayer numbered, this would at once put the whole book at disposal, if justifiable occasion arose, for using portions of it in any reasonable manner other than present rubrics required. He wished for a considerable shortening of the Baptismal Service and a reconstruction of the second portion of the office of private baptism. A few additions and varieties to some existing offices were also needful. Such varieties and additions would not involve difficulties. Bishops must cease to silence them with the judicial observation, "Let us keep close to the words of the Act of Uniformity." But let the clergy be hearty and yet not extravagant in their demands. An enrichment of the Book of Common Prayer was also greatly required. The needs of the Church would not be fully supplied without some complete additional offices. Certainly an additional service for Sunday afternoon or evening was much to be desired in some parishes. There ought to be a carefully drawn up, lively, hearty office for the institution of a priest to the charge of a parish. The people themselves should be almost the leaders of that peculiar office. There should be a special office for Advent, another for Epiphany, another for Good Friday, and special offices for Rogation Tyde, having reference to the crops, the manufactures, the shipping, and the commerce of the nation, and provision for a processional service through the parish. Had the Church lost nothing, had she not ceased to hold together tens of thousands of the people because she had no clear, concise, but withal fully complete Catechism, historically recounting leading facts from Pentecost till now, and in a sound and clear teaching of Church principles by which all might be held together as one? Sunday schools required systematic and graduated books of teaching for the half-dozen standards of attainment which the people ought to acquire in them. Great benefits to others would be secured, if, under Episcopal authority and wise regulations, such services were occasionally permitted within the nave of the church as would be little more than such as many pious Dissenters were accustomed to hold within their own houses of meeting.

The Rev. Arthur J. Robinson did not think the Prayer-Book called for any great and drastic changes. One of the difficulties, especially to people who were not habitual Churchgoers, was to find their way through the Prayer-Book. As to the length of the morning service, which some people complained of, it should be remembered that the three services of Morning Prayer, Litany, and Holy Communion need not be said together, and the old custom of saying them all together was not so prevalent as it used to be. There was a need for supplementary services. Education would, and did, lead to a desire for a Liturgy rather than extempore prayer, but as thousands went through the Board schools with no instruction in the Prayer-Book, much simple and plain dealing would still be needed in the matter of worship. The details he would have altered seemed very small, but no detail could be beneath their notice, for their aim must ever be to make their prayers in reality what they were in name—Common Prayer.

The Rev. R. W. Randall said he had preached at a harvest thanksgiving service, which was wholly distinct from regular services, and this at the invitation of the Dean of Worcester. There was a very large liberty, and let the clergy use it. It was not now as when a farmer who desired to return thanks for deliverance from a bull was recommended to use the service for the churching of women.

The Rev. Dr. Hale, from the United States, explained the position of the question there. It was well that the American Church did not make more changes a century ago. A revised Prayer-Book had been prepared and awaited the approval of the Convention, which would be influenced by public opinion in England as well as in America. Perhaps the ultimate result would be a supplement to the existing book.

Mr. Beresford-Hope, M.P., said there seemed to be a consensus of opinion that the services required to be revised, but not substantially altered. The difficulty was at once to meet the needs of the devout, and to reach those to be brought in. It was clear that great variety might now be produced by permutations and combinations. The suggestion of legislation frightened him; in the House of Commons many would look upon it as a deep and dangerous conspiracy.

The Rev. T. H. Clark thought services could be made more attractive by the omission of certain repetitions.

Mr. E. J. Counsel, of Worcester, said there had been successful experiments in special services, such as those on the return of the troops from the Soudan and Christmas Eve services, and these showed what was possible with a wise connivance.

Mr. H. F. Harris objected to altering any of the prayers. A clergyman often seemed to be in the mission-room a different man from what he was in his own church. Many sermons were preached about the faith of Abraham and few about the sin of lying. Life in sermons would increase attendance at church.

The Rev. J. V. Foot denied that a clergyman had the right to accentuate words in a public service. He ought to keep to a reverent monotone. As to connivance, Bishops were men, and one would connive up and another down.

The Rev. J. Martin, of the Irish Church, said the differences in its services were permissive with one exception, but many of the permissible changes were not made. He would give the Church less liberty, but a larger number of forms to select from. Too much latitude would proclaim the division into high, low, and broad sections.

The Bishop of Carlisle, in closing, said the American proposed Book was well worth consideration. If all reformers were locked up in a room for months he did not think they would all agree upon any particular change. So we might be happy with the Prayer-Book useless and the judicious connivance of the Bishops. This would give many of the clergy all that freedom they desired. But he did not like the word connive; however, he would be sorry to bring strict law to bear on a clergyman's zeal, and much might be done without any connivance so long as the ordinary services were read. A layman conducted a Sunday-school in a church, and that was no breach of the law. He would not find fault with a clergyman who used his church too much or in a way Lord Penzance might hold to be not strictly regular.

This closed the discussion.

(*Continued on Page* 651 *of* Paper.)

ROYAL
FIRE & LIFE INSURANCE COMPANY.

LIVERPOOL: NORTH JOHN STREET; LONDON: LOMBARD STREET.

FUNDS.

CAPITAL PAID UP		£280,545	0 0
FIRE FUND	£550,000 0 0		
CONFLAGRATION FUND	200,000 0 0		
		750,000	0 0
RESERVE FUND		1,100,000	0 0
BALANCE OF PROFIT AND LOSS		150,095	6 8
LIFE FUNDS		3,058,767	2 6
		£5,348,107	0 2

Churches, Chapels, and Glebe Houses of best construction insured at 1s. 6d. per cent. per Annum. Farm Buildings 3s. per cent. per Annum. These minimum rates are offered by the "Royal," who also afford perfect security with no liability to its insured with the LARGE CASH FUNDS mentioned above.

Insurances paid in advance for seven years will be charged for six years' premium only.

LIFE BONUS YEAR.

£7 10s. per cent. has just been added to the sums assured under Participating Policies in force during the past quinquennium.
Moderate rate of premium and liberal conditions.
Prospectuses and Forms of Proposal can be obtained at any of the Company's Offices or Agencies.
Gentlemen in a position to influence business are invited to communicate with either the Liverpool or London Office.

J. H. McLAREN, Manager.
DIGBY JOHNSON, Sub-Manager.
J. H. CROFT, Secretary in London.

GENTLEMEN WOULD BE SENT TO ARRANGE ANY INSURANCES OF IMPORTANCE.

THE GRESHAM
LIFE ASSURANCE SOCIETY.

ESTABLISHED 1848.

Incorporated under the Act 7 and 8 Vic., c. 110. Registered under the Act 25 and 26 Vic., c. 89.

Head Office: ST. MILDRED'S HOUSE, POULTRY, LONDON, E.C.

Board of Directors.

W. H. THORNTHWAITE, Esq., *Chairman.*
H. C. T. BEADNELL, Esq.
F. W. BUTTERWORTH, Esq.
RICHARD CRAWLEY, Esq.
ALFRED H. SMEE, Esq.
EDWARD SOLLY, Esq., F.R.S.
W. THORNTHWAITE, Esq.
WILLIAM TREGO, Esq.
GEORGE TYLER, Esq.

Branch Offices.

ENGLAND.

BIRMINGHAM—18, Bennett's Hill.
BRADFORD—Bank Chambers, Bank Street.
BRIGHTON—4, Pavilion Buildings.
BRISTOL—1, Broad Quay.
LIVERPOOL—Gresham Buildings, 99, Dale Street.
MANCHESTER—2, Coper Street.
NEWCASTLE—Percy Buildings, Grainger Street.
NORWICH—Bank Plain.
NOTTINGHAM—St. John's Chambers, Bridlesmith Gate.
SHEFFIELD—Parade Chambers, High Street.
STOCKTON-ON-TEES—Bank Chambers.
SUNDERLAND—36, Fawcett Street.

WALES.

CARDIFF—Gresham House, Roath.

SCOTLAND.

GLASGOW—63, St. Vincent Street. | EDINBURGH—73, George Street. | ABERDEEN—28, Market Street.

IRELAND.

DUBLIN—5, Westmoreland Street.

Moderate Rates of Premium. Liberal Scale of Annuities. Loans granted upon Security of Freehold, Copyhold, and Leasehold Property, Life Interests and Reversions; also to Corporate and other Public Bodies, upon Security of Rates, &c.

Prospectuses, Reports, and Proposal Forms can be obtained on application to the Society's Agents and Branch Offices, or to

JOSEPH ALLEN, Secretary.

Printed by E. D. Maddick and Co., 1, Crane-court, Fleet-street, and Published for the Proprietor, at the Office, No. 6, Whitefriars-street, Fleet-street.—Saturday, October 10, 1885.